EXPLICATIONS and DEFENCES

OF

P. GIBBS's LETTER

To the CONGREGATION of

PROTESTANT DISSENTERS

MEETING IN

MARE-STREET, HACKNEY.

By PHILIP GIBBS.

To be publiſhed in ſeveral NUMBERS.

"Studious and inquiſitive Men commonly at ſuch an Age, at "Forty, or Fifty at the utmoſt, have fixed and ſettled their "Judgments in moſt Points, and as it were made their *laſt* "*Underſtanding*; ſuppoſing they have thought, or read, or heard "what can be ſaid on all Sides of Things; and after that, they "grow poſitive and impatient of Contradiction, thinking it a "Diſparagement to them to alter their Judgment: But our "deceaſed Friend was ſo wiſe as to be willing to learn to the "*laſt*; knowing that no Man can grow wiſer without ſome "Change of his Mind, without gaining ſome Knowledge which "he had not, or correcting ſome Error which he had before."

Archbiſhop Tillotſon's *Serm. at the Funeral of Dr.* Witchcott.

"Non quia *ſemel* erratum eſt, ideo *ſemper* errandum eſſe; cum "magis ſapientibus & Deum timentibus congruat pateſactæ & "perſpectæ veritati libenter & incunctanter obſequi, quam "pertinaciter atque obſtinatè reluctari. A Man's having once "erred, is not a Reaſon why he ſhould continue to err; for "that it becomes wiſe Men, and ſuch as fear God, to yield "freely and readily to Truth, whenever made known to them, "rather than to perſiſt obſtinately in rejecting it."

Cyprian, *Epiſt.* 73. *Edit. Oxon.* p. 208.

LONDON:

Printed for the AUTHOR, and Sold by T. Cox, at the *Lamb* under the *Royal-Exchange*. MDCCXL.

[Price One Shilling.]

NUMBER I.

Relating wholly to the Doctrine of the TRINITY.

THERE are *three* Ways of ſtating this important Doctrine, mentioned in my Letter, *p.* 5. and as to *each* of theſe I have declared, and do declare, my *Diſbelief* and *Diſlike*; more eſpecially the Way of ſtating it in the Creed, commonly called St. *Athanaſius*'s, which ſeems to aſcribe a real *Perſonality* to the *Father*, the *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, together with a *numerical or individual Sameneſs of Nature*, and an *Equality full*, and *perfect*. For is it not here expreſly ſaid? 'There is one PERSON of the *Father*, another [PERSON] of the *Son*, and another of the *Holy Ghoſt*: 'But the *Godhead* of the *Father*, of the *Son*, and of 'the *Holy Ghoſt* is ALL ONE: The *Glory* EQUAL, 'the Majeſty CO-ETERNAL. *Such* as the *Father* is, 'SUCH is the *Son*, and SUCH is the *Holy Ghoſt*, *viz.* '*Uncreate*, *Incomprehenſible*, *Almighty*, *God* and *Lord*. And farther on 'tis affirmed, '*None is afore, or after another*; *none* is *greater or leſs than another*; but 'the *whole three Perſons together* are CO-ETERNAL 'and CO-EQUAL.' Likewiſe at the Beginning; 'We '*worſhip one God in Trinity*, and *Trinity in Unity*, 'neither confounding the *Perſons*, nor dividing the '*Subſtance*.' So that a CONSUBSTANTIALITY, or (as it is otherwiſe termed) CO-ESSENTIALITY, and CO-EQUALITY of three divine PERSONS, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, appears here to be plainly taught, and is preſented to us as the Object of every Chriſtian's Faith.

Now my Letter assigns several Reasons, why I can no longer believe THIS Doctrine of the Trinity; and afterwards suggests divers Grounds of a peculiar Dislike that I have to it: *Both* which I shall go over again distinctly, and would endeavour farther to *illustrate* and *vindicate*. The rather, considering how much Artifice is used, in an Examination of them, publish'd a while since[a], to darken and hide their Force, along with great Shew and Ostentation of Argument to invalidate and destroy it. And if in the present Performance I very frequently bring Quotations from other Mens Works, I hope that either the absolute Needfulness of them, or their Pertinency at least to the Design I am carrying on, will plead my Excuse.

The first Reason assigned by me for not believing the Doctrine of the Trinity, as stated in the *Athanasian* Creed, is this: That I apprehend the Doctrine (thus stated) not to be delivered in sacred Writ: Or, to keep to the Words of my Letter, because no *such* Propositions (as those wherein the Creed lays it down, for of what Propositions else can I be fairly understood to speak? No *such* Propositions) are to be met with in the Scriptures. *This*, if true, I imagined would pass currently among *Protestants*[b], and all by whom the Authority and Perfection of Scripture is acknowledged, not only for a good substantial Reason, but the very *best* that could be rendered. For the Doctrine of the Trinity is indisputably a Doctrine of *mere Revelation*, and knowable only from *thence*. Of

[a] *Vid.* Postscript to the Congregation of Protestant Dissenters at *Hackney*, under the pastoral Care of Mr. *Barker*, p. 3.

[b] I shall take it for granted in a *Protestant* Country, that Scripture is the only Standard of all necessary revealed Truth: Neither in the present Instance (*viz.* what he is considering, the Article of the Trinity) is there any Room for a *traditionary* Faith. For besides that all the Fathers and ancient Writers ground their Expositions of the Trinity wholly upon Scripture, I cannot conceive that the Subject is capable of a plainer Revelation, as I shall endeavour to shew more fully in the following Discourse. *Some Considerations concerning the Trinity*, p. 13.

Of Consequence, the *Standard* whereby to regulate and adjust all our Notions and Expressions about it, ought to be the Writing, or Writings, wherein the Revelation is made, *i. e.* the holy Scriptures. And if *here* then we have no *such* Propositions as the Creed contains; that is to say, neither the same in so many Words, nor others in Terms and Phrases equivalent (for such certainly includes both) however the Reason may be sneer'd at [a], the Validity of it will abide. Whatsoever is not read in Scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is not required of any Man that it should be believed as an Article of Faith. *Articles of the Church of* England, No. 6.

Ay, But is not this Proposition, THESE THREE ARE ONE, to be found in Scripture? Is not there too the *Form of Baptism*, and the *Form of Blessing*? And *many others* to the same Purpose are literally written in the Word of God [b].

As to the first of these Texts asserting, *Three*, viz. Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, to be *One*, I answer: That allowing the *Genuineness* of the Text (which yet, to all versed in the Trinitarian Controversy, is well known to have been strongly contested, and brought into Doubt [c]; but if we allow the Text to be genuine) why must it be interpreted of *Unity* in *Nature* and *Essence*, a *numerical Unity*, and *Sameness* or *Equality* of Godhead? The Apostle is here manifestly speaking of the *Three* as *bearing Witness*, or giving

[a] A sweet Reason. *Anonymus*, p. 3.

[b] Postscript, *p.* 4.

[c] Vid. *Emlyn*'s Collect. Tracts, *p.* 308, *& seq.* Sober Appeal, *p.* 33. Dr. *Clarke*'s Commentary on 40 Texts, *p.* 206. Modest Plea, *p.* 316. Answer to *Wells*, p. 40, in which last the Dr. assures his Reader, The whole Text is wanting in all the ancient Versions in all Languages, and that it does not with any Certainty appear to have been ever found so much as in any one MSS. Copy of the *Greek* that is, or ever was, in the World, but seems rather to have been first added in the *Greek*, even after the Invention of Printing:——That in the first *English* Bibles after the Reformation, in the Time of *Henry* VIII. and *Edward* VI. it was printed in a *different* Character, to signify its being wanting in the Original, which Distinction came afterwards to be neglected, *p.* 45.

giving Testimony to a particular Truth, namely, the great fundamental Truth of Christian Religion mentioned just before, *Jesus's being the Messiah*, or *Son of God*. And when He says they are *One*, may we not understand him as designing to declare, that they are one under that *View* and *Consideration* of them, or that they unite and agree in the *same Testimony*? This is the most natural and obvious Sense of the Words, best suiting with the Scope of the Apostle in the Context, and entirely agreeable to the Use of the Phrase elsewhere in the New Testament [a]. No Wonder therefore it should be admitted and approved by many Divines, esteemed orthodox both amongst *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*. Mr. *Calvin* himself is for this Sense, acknowledging that the Apostle's Assertion refers not to *Essence*, but rather Consent. [*Ad Essentiam non refertur, sed ad* Consensum *potius*.] And 'tis past Doubt with him, that Father, Word, and Spirit, are said to be one in the *same* Sense, as afterwards the Blood, the Water, and the Spirit. 'Nonnulli Codices habent εἰς ἕν. Verum etiamsi legas ἕν εἰσιν, ut est in aliis Exemplaribus, *non* tamen *dubium est* quin Pater, Sermo, & Spiritus, *eodem* sensu dicantur unum esse, quo postea Sanguis, & Aqua, & Spiritus.' *Calv. in locum.*

As to the Form of Baptism, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name, or *into* the Name [εἰς τὸ ὄνομα] of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; what is there declared here concerning the *essential Unity* of the Sacred Three; their having a *Sameness of Godhead* belonging to them; or being *consubstantial* and *co-equal*? Not a Word of this can be pretended to be *explicitly* affirmed. But may not thus much however be supposed to be necessarily

[a] See Mr. *Taylor*'s Further Defence, *p.* 10. *&* *seq.* in which he particulary considers the six other Places of the New Testament, where the same Phrase and Manner of Expression is made use of; and he shews, that in not one of those Places does it signify Unity as to Essence or Substance.——The three are *one*, ἕν, one and the same Thing, *in Effect*. Dr. *Clarke*'s Script. Doct. *p.* 231.

ſarily implied? Seeing the Form names the *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, in *Conjunction* with the *Father*, without any Note or Hint of *Inferiority*; and alſo requires Men to be baptized into *their Name*, as much as *His*. I anſwer, if the bare naming of them *together*, will infer their Unity and Sameneſs as to Godhead; why ſhould not the Apoſtle's naming the *elect Angels*, and joining them with God the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, infer the like? As in *Luke* ix. 26. The Son of Man ſhall come in his own Glory [literally in the Glory of *himſelf*, ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ] and of the Father, and of the holy Angels. 1 *Tim.* v. 21. I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect Angels[a]. Then, whereas 'tis pleaded, that we have no Note of any Inferiority or Inequality in the Form of Baptiſm, not the *leaſt* [Poſt. *p.* 20.] This, I think, is effectually *diſprov'd* from the *Introduction* to the Commiſſion, which immediately precedes: *Ver.* 18. Jeſus came and ſpake to his Diſciples, ſaying: All Power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth; Go ye *therefore* and teach all Nations, baptizing them, *&c.* Is not here a plain Intimation of an Inferiority in the Perſon ſtiled the *Son*, in that he founds the Commiſſion given by him to his Diſciples, upon a Power or Authority [ἐξουσία] delegated to him from the Father? And though 'tis ſtill farther urged, that the Form preſcribes Baptizing into the Name of the Sacred Trinity *equally*, and *without Difference*; as *much* into the Name of the Son, and *Holy Ghoſt*, as the *Father Himſelf*: This, how plauſible an Argument ſoever it may appear at firſt View, to prove the Thing for which it is brought, when it comes to be tried, will be found weak and inconcluſive: Becauſe baptizing People in, or into, the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, may poſſibly mean (as Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* ſays[b]) initiating them by that Rite or Ceremony into the Chriſtian Religion, upon

[a] *Vid.* Defence of *Peirce's* Queries, *p.* 36.
[b] Sermon 70. Vol. II. *p.* 513.

upon their Profession of the *necessary Doctrines* of it concerning the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, and a solemn Stipulation and Engagement to live according to those Doctrines. Unless, therefore, the *Consubstantiality* of *Father*, Son, and *Spirit*, and their being co-equal amongst themselves, is taught elsewhere in the New Testament (and whether it be really so, or not, the Reader will be able to judge from the Sequel) it can't be proved, no not by Inference, from this Text*.

As to the *Form of Blessing*, 2 *Cor.* xiii. *ult.* The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God, and the Communion, or Communication, of the Holy Ghost be with you, *Amen:* Here is as little declared, I mean in *express* Words, of the *Consubstantiality* or *Co-equality* of the Sacred Three, as in the foregoing Form of Baptism; nor do I see how it can be justly *drawn out* from *this* Text any more than *that*. We have *here* indeed one of those numerous Texts which will ere long come under our Consideration, wherein the Name God is taken absolutely and meant of the Father, as the learned Bishop *Pearson* observes and allows. *Pearson* on the Creed, *p.* 40.

With respect to the *many more* Texts that the Author of the Postscript speaks of, as teaching the *Athanasian Doctrine*, that the *Son* and *Spirit* are *consubstantial* and co-equal with the Father, 'twill be Time enough to reply to them when produced. In the mean

* How the Text was universally understood in the Primitive Church, little Room is left to doubt; there being a professed Paraphrase of it, even the *Apostles Creed*, which from the earliest Times of Christianity was, with very small Variation, in the several Churches, the *baptismal* Creed, or Profession of Faith, which all Christians were taught on purpose that they might understand what it was they were baptized into. And nothing can be more preposterous than, instead of comparing this Text with the ancient baptismal Creed, and with other Texts of Scripture, to reduce on the contrary both the Words of the Text and the Creed to the Standard of new scholastick Hypotheses. Dr. *Clarke*'s Commentary on 40 Texts, *p.* 204, 205. See likewise the Reply to *Waterland*'s first Defence, *p.* 410, 411.

mean while let me aſk, if there was any ſingle Text throughout the whole Scripture which did in the Opinion of this anonymous Author teach ſuch Doctrine after a *plainer Manner*, or in more *ſtrong ſignificant Terms*, than the three Paſſages already enquired into, is it to be thought he would not have obliged us with the Citation of it?—So that from hence a Judgment may be formed, whether the *Unſcripturalneſs* of the ſaid Doctrine be not juſtly aſſignable as *one* ſolid weighty Reaſon for diſbelieving it.

But my Letter goes on, and alledges another Reaſon for this, carrying ſtill more Weight and Force, *viz.* that the Doctrine of the Trinity (ſtated in the Way above-mention'd) is *anti-ſcriptural*; or repugnant to, and irreconcilable with, ſacred Writ, as well as not delivered therein. For though what I immediately ſubjoin to the Words quoted before, is not thus expreſſed indeed, this is clearly the Amount of all that follows in the Remainder of the Paragraph. 'No ſuch Propoſitions are to be met with in Scripture. —— On the CONTRARY, to us, ſays the 'Apoſtle, There is one God, *viz.* the FATHER, of 'whom are all Things, and we for him; even as to 'us there is one LORD Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are 'all Things, and we by him. *So* (on the contrary) 'in another Place, 'tis aſſerted by St. *Paul*, That there 'is one *Spirit*, one *Lord*, and one *God and Father* 'of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us 'all, *Epheſ.* iv. 5, 6, 7. The Father too [I add] 'is in *ſome hundreds* of Places ſtiled God *abſolutely*, 'and by Way of *Eminence*, and with *peculiar high* '*Titles* and *Epithets*: And to make the Son and Spirit *equal* with HIM, is inconſiſtent with the numerous Texts which affirm both of them to be OF and 'FROM *Him*, and to act in all Things by *His* Miſ'ſion, Authority, and Will.' I have taken the Liberty thus to lay before the Reader what relates to the *Anti-ſcripturalneſs* of this Doctrine, ſtated in the *Athanaſian* Way, that it might be ſeen by him *together*, in

 one

one View: And when the Particulars are gone over, 'twill appear, I hope, that no more is advanced by me, than what I am able to make good. The first Passage of Scripture which I cite as repugnant to *this* Doctrine, is that noted Declaration of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* viii. 6. To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all Things, *&c.* For the right Understanding of this Passage, the two preceding Verses ought to be looked into; where he says, An Idol is nothing in the World, and there is none other God but one. [οὐδεὶς θεὸς ἕτερος εἰ μὴ εἷς; none other but one is God.] For though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, as there be Gods many, and Lords many: Yet, or but, to us there is one God the Father, [or to us one is God, even the Father] of whom are all Things, and we in him: And one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all Things, and we by him. In these Words then, the Apostle is evidently instructing Christians whom they are to regard as the one (true supreme) God, in Opposition to the many fictitious sovereign Deities of the Heathen. And for this Purpose he not only declares him by *Name* to be the FATHER; but expresly *contradistinguishes* him from *Jesus Christ* our Lord. Nay, he adds likewise a descriptive Title and Character of Him, which is *appropriate to Him*, and *uncapable* of being applied to *any else*. To us Christians is one God, the *Father*; of whom, [ἐξ οὗ] from whom are all Things; and we for, or in him. The learned Mr. *Mede* hath, in my Opinion, excellently well paraphras'd these Words, as follows. 'Tho' there 'be *Gods many* (says he) *i. e.* many cœlestial sovereign 'Deities: And *Lords many*, i. e. many *Baalims*, Lords 'Agents, and Presidents of earthly Things; yet to us 'Christians there is but one Sovereign God, the *Father*, 'of whom are all Things, and we [εἰς αὐτὸν, as it is in 'the *Greek*] to *him*, i. e. to whom, as supreme, we are 'to direct all our Services: And but one Lord Jesus 'Christ, one *Lord Agent*, instead of their many *Baalims*

 'and

'and Dæmon Mediators, by whom are all Things, 'which come from the Father to us, and thro' 'whom alone we find Access to him. The Allusion, 'methinks, is passing elegant, and such as cannot be 'duly understood without this Distinction of *superior* 'and *inferior* Deities in the Divinity of the *Gentiles*; 'they having a *Plurality* in *both* Sorts, and we but *one* 'in *each*, as our Apostle affirmeth.' *Mede*'s Discourse on 2 *Pet*. ii. 1. And now I leave the Reader to judge, whether I might not warrantably enough insert, after the Word, *God*, in this Text, the Contraction of *videlicet*; and what a Disposition to cavil and find Fault it shews in a Writer who shall *complain* of my so doing, and represent it as meant to *eke out*[a]. Especially seeing how often the Particle καὶ, equivalent surely to *viz.* is put between Θεὸς and Πατὴρ, *i. e. Even* is put between God and Father. *Rom.* xvi. 6. With one Mind, and one Mouth, to glorify God, even the Father. 2 *Cor*. i. 3. Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, *&c.* Chap. xi. 31. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ knoweth [*Gr.* ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ] *&c.*

The next Text to which the before-stated *Athanasian* Doctrine is affirmed to be repugnant, is, *Ephes.* iv. 5, 6, 7. Where we are told, that there is one *Spirit*, one *Lord*, and *one God and Father of* all[b], who is *above all*, and through all, and in us all. In what *express Terms*, and by what *peculiar Characters*, is *God*, even the FATHER, distinguished from the *one Lord*; as also the *one Spirit*, spoken of in the same Sentence! And by interposing other Things *between*, *viz.* one Faith, one Baptism, the Distinction becomes still more remarkably apparent[c].

[a] The Apostle tells us, there is one God, the Father; he does not add *viz.* as Mr. *Gibbs* ekes it out, *Post.* p. 4.

[b] Πατὴρ πάντων, Father of the Universe.

[c] The Reader will have a fuller Insight into the genuine Sense of this, as well as the former Text, and be convinced of the utter Repugnancy of the Doctrine which they both teach to the *Athanasian* Scheme,

My Letter proceeds with alledging, as a farther Proof of the Contrariety of the foresaid *Athanasian* Doctrine to *Scripture*, that the Father is, in some *hundreds* of Places, stiled God *absolutely*, and by Way of *Eminence*, and with *peculiar* high *Titles* and *Attributes*, p. 6. For the *Truth* of *this* Assertion, I refer the Reader to a *Collection of these Texts* actually *made* by Dr. *Clarke*, and to be seen in his Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, Chap. i. Sect. 1, 2, 3. The two former Sections recite the Passages wherein the Father is stiled the *one God*, and God *absolutely by way of Eminence*, the Number of which is 300, and upwards [a]. And the third Section contains the Passages wherein he is stiled God, with some peculiar high Titles, Attributes, or Epithets, which amount to about 100 [b]. Wherefore the Truth of my Assertion cannot be gainsaid: And if so, 'tis left with every impartial Reader to judge, whether there must not be a

Scheme, if he consults (as I would wish him to do) Dr. *Clarke*, in his Reply to *Nelson*, p. 68, 94, 95. Observrtions on *Waterland*'s second Defence, *p.* 10, *& seq.* Modest Plea, *p.* 239. *Jackson*'s Reply (Pref. *p.* 14.) 29, 142, 196, 425, 429, 438, 461. Christian Liberty asserted, *p.* 6, 42, 44. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. *Waterland*, p. 70, 71, 72. Collection Queries, *p.* 109. Sober Appeal, *p.* 51. Essay towards Demonstration of the Trinity, *p.* 127. *Chubb*'s Tracts, *p.* 19. *Whitby*'s last Thoughts, *p.* 47.

[a] Concerning this the Doctor observes, Reply to *Nelson*, p. 7. It is a Matter of Fact that shews itself in full Light to every Man's own Eyes, at the first Sight. Accordingly too, Bp. *Pearson* freely owns, *p.* 40. That the Name of God taken *absolutely*, is often in the Scripture spoken of the Father. The like Concession is made by Dr. *Waterland*, 2d Defence, *p.* 54. And even Mr. *Anonymous* won't offer to deny, that the Father is absolutely called God in many hundreds of Places, *p.* 4.

[b] The more notable of these Titles, *&c.* are, Lord of Heaven and Earth, *Matth.* xi. 25. ὕψιστος, Supreme, or Most High, *Mark* v. 7. *Luke* i. 32, 35, 70. Chap. viii. 28. *Heb.* vii. 1. The invisible God, *John* i. 18. Chap. vi. 46. *Colos.* i. 15. The God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, *Acts* iii. 13. God only wise, *Rom.* xvi. 27. The Blessed and only Potentate, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, 1 *Tim.* vi. 15, 16. The true God, 1 *John* v. 20. Yea the *only* true God, *John* xvii. 3. The Lord Almighty, supreme over all, παντοκράτωρ, *Rev.* i. 4. The God of Christ, *John* xx. 17. *Ephes.* i. 18. *Heb.* i. 7. The Head of Christ, 1 *Cor.* xi. 3.

a *certain Superiority* in the *Father*, or ſome ſuch *Pre-eminence* belonging to him, as is *inconſiſtent* with that *full Equality* between the *Son*, and *Spirit*, and *Him*, which is taught by the *Athanaſian* Creed, and other Writers, whoſe Sentiments agree with it.

I know that *Objections* to this (how ſeemingly clear ſoever) are raiſed by the Author of Remarks on Dr. *Clarke*'s Script. Doct. *p.* 14, 23, 94, 95. To each of which Objections the Doctor has given ſatisfactory Replies, in his Anſwer to that Author, *p.* 231, 236, 276, 277, 278. And to the chief and grand Objection of all, namely, that the Word *God*, when mentioned *abſolutely*, is applied to the *Son* in Scripture, as well as to the *Father* (which is much what the ſame as Mr. *Anonymous* urges, [a]) he, in particular, thus replies; Anſwer, *p.* 279. 'There are, in 'all, thirteen Texts, wherein the Word *God* has been 'thought by ſome to ſignify the Son; [*Matth.* i. 23. '*Luke* i. 16. *John* i. 1. x. 33. Chap. xx. 28. *Acts* xx. '28. *Rom.* ix. 5. 1 *Tim.* iii. 6. *Titus* ii. 13. *Heb.* i. '8. 2 *Pet.* i. 1. 1 *John* iii. 16. Chap. v. 20.] In *five* 'of which Texts [*viz. Luke* i. 16. *Titus* ii. 13. 2 *Pet.* 'i. 1. 1 *John* iii. 16. and 1 *John* v. 20.] it certainly 'ſignifies not the *Son*, but the *Father*. *Six* of them, '[*viz. Matth.* i. 23. *John* x. 33. Chap. xx. 28. *Acts* 'xx. 28. *Rom.* ix. 5. and 1 *Tim.* iii. 16.] are juſtly con-'teſted as *ambiguous:* That is to ſay, either it is ambi-'guous, whether the Word Θεὸς was originally in the 'Text at all; as *Acts* xx. 28. *Rom.* ix. 5. 1 *Tim.* iii. '16. Or elſe it is ambiguous, whether it refers to the '*Father*, or to the *Son:* And if it refers to the *Son*, 'yet it is then clearly underſtood in a Senſe different 'from what this learned Author ſuppoſes, as in the 'three laſt cited Texts, and in *Matth.* i. 23. *John* x. '33. and *John* xx. 28. The two remaining Texts '[*John* i. 1. *Heb.* i. 8.] wherein the Son is clearly ſtiled 'God, do each of them, at the ſame Time, no leſs 'clearly

[a] Poſt. *p.* 4. Yet the Son, in many other Places, is ſtiled God abſolutely, as well as the Father.

'clearly distinguish him from ὁ Θεὸς, the God whom 'he was *with*, whom he *came from*, and who is stiled 'HIS GOD, anointing him, *&c.* which Distinction is 'also no less evident in every one of the contested 'Texts, supposing the Reading of them to be *true*, 'and the *Son* to be there spoken of: As may be seen 'in NOTES upon each of the Texts themselves, both in 'the foregoing Papers, and in my Script. Doctrine'.[2]

'Well; but the Name JEHOVAH is always used ab-'solutely; is religiously and constantly appropriated to 'GOD MOST HIGH; and more especially signifies his '*necessary Existence, Independence, eternal and unchange-'able Essence*: But each of the Blessed Three are called 'Jehovah in a great Number of Texts', *Anon.* p. 4. I answer that, without staying to debate the Matter with him of the most *proper*, or *special Signification* of the Name Jehovah (for which the Reader will yet see there is Room, if he peruses the first of the three Letters to Dr. *Clarke* from a Clergyman, *p.* 9, 10, 11. Modest Plea, *p.* 22, 23, 163, 221, 274. Collection Queries, *p.* 19, 20. and Bishop *Hare*'s *Prolegomena in Psalmos*, p. 13, 14, 15.) I deny that this Name is given

[2] Besides which Notes on all the now mentioned Texts, the Reader will find other Comments and Strictures on most of them, that I crave Leave to recommend to his Perusal. As, on *John* i. 1. Mr. *Emlyn*'s Tracts, *p.* 390, *&* *seq.* *Jackson*'s Reply, *p.* 45, 46, 47, 178, 181. Modest Plea, *p.* 19, 20, 45, 81. Sober Appeal, *p.* 114, *&* *seq.* *Chubb*'s Tracts, *p.* 39. Essay towards Demonstration, *&c.* p. 135, *&* *seq.* Sober and charitable Disquisition concerning the Importance of the Doct. of the Trinity, *p.* 53, 54, 55. On *John* x. 33. *Chubb*, p. 23. Collect. Queries, *p.* 68. On *John* xx. 28. Modest Plea, *p.* 84. On *Acts* xx. 28. *Emlyn*, p. 206, 263. Sober Appeal, *p.* 144. On *Rom.* ix. 5. Sober Appeal, *p.* 92. *Jackson*'s Reply, *p.* 13, 14. Essay, *p.* 147. Christian Liberty asserted, *p.* 93, *&* *seq.* Dr. *Whitby*'s last Thoughts, *p.* 79, 80, On 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. Modest Plea, *p.* 58, 83, 95. On *Titus* ii. 13. Sober Appeal, *p.* 60, 91. On *Heb.* i. 8. *Emlyn*, p. 10. *Jackson*'s Reply, *p.* 175. *Chubb*, p. 15, 17. Modest Plea, *p.* 83. Essay, *p.* 146. Christian Liberty asserted, *p.* 86, *&* *seq.* Defence of Mr. *Peirce*'s Queries, *p.* 3, 4. Sober Disquisition, *p.* 64, *&* *seq.* On 1 *John* iii. 16. Sober Appeal, *p.* 144. On 1 *John* v. 20. Sober Appeal, *p.* 90, 91. *Chubb*, p. 43.

given to each of the Sacred Three, in *many*, or a great Number of Texts: So far from it, that I desire a *single* Text may be brought wherein the Name is *clearly* and *expresly* given to the Holy Spirit. This Author produces *no such* Text, neither *here*; no, nor *afterwards*, when he comes to lay down what he takes to be the Scripture Doctrine of the Spirit. And though he is pleas'd to refer to *others* who have done it *for* him, and that (as it should seem, by his Way of talking) *largely* and *abundantly* [a], *viz.* Dr. *Owen*, Dr. *Calamy*, and Dr. *Watts*; yet I meet with but *four* of *such* Texts, or *five* at the most, pretended to be cited by these Authors, (*Isa.* vi. 3, 9. *Exod.* xvii. 7. xxxiv. 34. *Deut.* xxxii. 12. *Psalm* xcv. 3. [b]] And as they attempt not to shew that the Holy Ghost is called Jehovah in any *one* of the said Texts, but by the Help of *Deduction* and *Inference*: So all the Proof they have offered of that Kind, is, in my humble Opinion, defective and weak. The *strongest*, I believe, must be allowed to be what arises from *Isaiah* vi. and *Acts* xxviii. compared. And the Force of *that* seems to be, in a great Measure, *taken off* by Dr. *Clarke*, not to say quite enervated. ‘ *Esaias* (as he observes) ‘ by the Revelation of the Holy Ghost, saw God ‘ sitting on the Throne of his Glory, and heard ‘ *Him*, saying, Go, *&c.* Thus St. *John*, in the *A-* ‘ *pocalypse*, being in *the Spirit*, Rev. i. 10. saw *God* ‘ sitting upon his Throne, and beheld *Christ* in his ‘ Glory. And the Words which *Christ himself* spake ‘ [*Rev.* Chap. ii. Chap. iii.] are in the very same ‘ Chapters said to be what the SPIRIT saith unto the ‘ Churches. So *here* likewise; what *Isaiah*, *in the* ‘ *Spirit*, heard *God* speaking, is said to be spoken by ‘ the Holy Ghost.—Whatever God speaks may very ‘ properly be said to be spoken by the Holy Ghost, ‘ because

[a] The same Names, Titles, *&c.* which are ascribed to the other two (Father and Son) are ascribed to the Spirit. These Things you may find proved at *large*, by Dr. *Owen*, *&c.*

[b] Postscript, *p.* 19.

'because God always speaks to his Prophets by the 'Inspiration of his Holy Spirit: And whatever is 'spoken by the Holy Ghost, may no less properly 'be said to be spoken by God, because 'tis spoken to 'the Prophet, by that Spirit which God has given 'them. Agreeable to the Observation of one of the 'Ancients, *Justin Martyr*; when, in the Writings of 'the Prophets (says he) you find a Person introduced 'speaking, do not then think that the Things are 'spoken by the inspired Persons themselves, but by 'the divine Word, [the prophetick Spirit he calls it 'presently after] which moves them. For sometimes '*it* [*viz.* the prophetick Spirit] directly foretels Things 'to come; sometimes it speaks as in the Person of '*God*, the Supreme Lord and Father of all; and 'sometimes it speaks as in the Person of Christ. Dr. '*Clarke*'s Script. Doct. *p.* 206. Reply to *Nelson*, p. '182, 186.' The Reader may see also Defence of *Peirce*'s Queries towards the Beginning; Modest Plea, *p.* 310; and Sober Appeal, *p.* 129, 130.

As for the Son's being called by the Name *Jehovah*, I don't offer to deny, or call it in Question. He clearly appears to me to be so in several Places of the Old Testament, though whether in so great a Number as Mr. *Anonymous* hints at, I can't say, because he has not set them down. But then, this will by no Means, I think, furnish us with a convictive, unanswerable Proof of what it is alledged for, namely, the *Son*'s having the very *same Essence* as the *Father*, or being *individually consubstantial* with Him, and equal to Him in all divine Perfections. For we are at Liberty to *suppose*, and there is enough to induce us so to do, that the Name *Jehovah* may be given to the Son, upon Account of his *personating* Jehovah, even *God the Father*, making Appearances in his *Name* and *Stead*, or being his *Messenger* and *Representative*. We find, in sundry Places of the Old Testament, *inferior created* Angels assuming the Person of God, and delivering themselves, *as if they* were Jehovah. The first angelick

gelick Appearance that we read of, is (if I remember right) that to *Hagar*, upon her fleeing from the Face of her Mistress, which *Moses* relates in *Gen.* xvi. 7, & *seq.* And after the Angel had enjoined her, instead of pursuing her Journey to *Egypt*, to go back and submit herself to her Mistress, he begins to speak in the Name and Person of the Lord, saying to her thus: I will multiply thy Seed exceedingly, that it shall not be number'd for Multitude, *&c.* Here is a Message plainly deliver'd to her by the Angel, *as in God's Stead*; and she seems to have put no other Construction upon it: Wherefore, 'tis said, she called the Name of the Lord that spake unto her, *viz.* by *his Angel*, thou God seest me. So *Gen.* xxi. 17, 18. God heard the Voice of the Lad, *i. e.* of *Hagar*'s Son *Ishmael*, crying; and the Angel of God called to her from Heaven, and said; What aileth thee, *Hagar?* Fear not, for God hath heard the Voice of the Lad where he is. Arise, lift up the Lad, and hold him in thine Hand, for *I* will make him a great Nation. Again, *Gen.* xxii. 11, 12. The Angel of the Lord [Jehovah] called to *Abraham* out of Heaven, and said —— Lay not thine Hand upon the Lad, neither do thou any Thing unto him, for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thine only Son from *Me*. And *Verses* 15, 16. The Angel of the Lord, we are told, called unto him out of Heaven the second Time, and said: By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord [saith Jehovah] for because thou hast done this Thing, in blessing *I* will bless thee, *&c.* The Words are not the Angel's *own*, but *God*'s: He speaks evidently by Commission here, declaring, as a Messenger, what Jehovah said. Thus we read of an Angel's coming up from *Gilgal* to *Bochim*, and using such a *God-like* Style; delivering himself after the same Manner as if God himself personally spoke, *Judges* ii. 1. *I* made you to go up out of *Egypt*, and have brought you unto the Land which *I* sware to your Fathers, and I said I will

 never

never break my Covenant with you, *&c.* So the Lord [Jehovah] is ſaid to put a Word in *Balaam*'s Mouth, even then when juſt before we read that God met him, *Numb.* xxiii. 4, 5. where it is moſt probable by God to underſtand the *Angel*, mentioned Chap. xxii. 35. whom the Lord employed to deliver his Mind unto him[a]. Other Inſtances to the ſame Purpoſe, if the Reader deſires them, are to be found in Dr. *Bennet*'s Diſcourſe on the Trinity, *p.* 56, 57. And the Doctor tells us he is perſuaded, that the Reaſon why the Angels are ſo often ſtiled אלהים [*Elohim*] in Scripture, is, becauſe they perſonated the Divine Majeſty, and ſo frequently tranſacted Matters in his Name, *p.* 61. Nay, 'tis exceeding obſervable (ſays the Doctor) that even *Men* have delivered Charges from God in ſuch Words as God himſelf would have uſed, had he ſpoken perſonally. *Ex. gr.* We read of *Moſes*, that he gave *Joſhua*, the Son of *Nun*, a Charge, running thus: Be ſtrong, and of good Courage, for thou ſhalt bring the Children of *Iſrael* into the Land which *I* ſwore unto them, and *I* will be with thee, *Deut.* xxxi. 23. And *Jeremy* is commanded to ſay to the *Jews* (without any Preface of thus ſaith the Lord, or the like) theſe very Words: As ye have forſaken me, and ſerved ſtrange Gods in your Land; ſo ſhall ye ſerve Strangers in a Land that is not yours, *Jer.* v. 19. An Inſtance of the ſame Kind, but clearer ſtill, is that in *Judges*, if we underſtand by the Angel there, as ſeveral noted Expoſitors do, a *Man* who was a *Meſſenger*, or *Prophet*, of the Lord, living at *Gilgal*. The Margin renders the Original [*Malak*] by Meſſenger, and the *Jews* take him to have been *Phinehas*. It might farther be obſerved, that being in the Tabernacle before the *Ark*, which was the ancient *Symbol* or *Emblem* of Jehovah's *Preſence*, is expreſſed by being before Jehovah.

[a] Vid. *Patrick*'s Appendix to his Paraphraſe on *Job*, p. 292. 8°.

vah [a]. Yea, and (as the Author of the Modeſt Plea remarks, *p.* 164.) even when the *Repreſentative* of God was a falſe and forbidden one, as in the Inſtance of the *Golden Calf*, yet the Expreſſion is, Tomorrow is a Feaſt to the *Lord*; ליהוה, to, or of *Jehovah*, Exod. xxxii. 25.

Is it not then a very ſuppoſable Caſe, that the Name *Jehovah* ſhould be applied to, or aſſumed by, one who was the *Repreſentative* and *Meſſenger of* Jehovah, with a *glorious Pre-eminence above any elſe*; and *that becauſe of his being ſuch*: I mean the promiſed Meſſias or our Lord Jeſus Chriſt? *He* is the *Angel*, concerning whom, (when the Lord God declares to the *Iſraelites* he would ſend *him* before them as their Protector and Guide) the high and peculiar Expreſſion is uſed, *My Name* is in him, *Exod.* xxiii. 20, 22, 23. He is alſo called the *Face*, or *Preſence*, Exod. xxxiii. 14. And the *Angel* of God's *Preſence*, Iſa. lxiii. 9. Likewiſe the *Angel* or *Meſſenger* of the *Covenant*, Mal. iii. 2. Surely then, if *other* Meſſengers of God ſpeak *as though* they were *Jehovah*, much rather might He ſpeak *thus*; and be alſo accordingly ſpoken of.

As for the Objection, that the Scripture aſſerts the Name *Jehovah* to be incommunicable, [*Pſalm* lxxxiii. 18. *Iſa.* xlii. 8. xlv. 5.] a large and full Reply (I think) is made hereto, by the Author of the Sober Appeal, *p.* 71, *& ſeq.* And this Author particularly examines the ſeveral Places in the Old Teſtament, where the Name *Jehovah* is aſcribed to *Chriſt*, [*Iſa.* vi. beginning. Chap. xlv. 24. *Jer.* xxiii. 6, *&c.*] After having done which, he writes thus, *p.* 89. 'We 'have now gone through all that our Author hath 'produced for making good his firſt Inſtance of a 'Name peculiar to the Great God, aſcribed to Chriſt.

 'And,

[a] 2 *Sam.* vii. 18. *David* the King went in, and ſat before the LORD, *i. e.* He went into the Tabernacle, and took his Seat there before the Ark, the Symbol of the Divine Preſence. *Vid.* Patrick in Loc.

'And, I think, it may be still a Question, whether 'the Name *Jehovah* be ever in the Old Testament 'attributed to Christ in his own Person: It should 'seem rather to be meant every where of the Father 'manifesting Himself in Him; or to be given to 'him (rather I would say) as the *Representative of* '*the Father*. We have evidently proved, that this 'Name, so far as it is declared to be peculiar and 'appropriate, is appropriated to the Person of the 'Father; whence it will follow, that if it be ever 'applied to *another Person*, it must be taken in a '[lower or] less perfect Sense; as our Author, and 'his Friends, own the Title of *God* is.'

Moreover, to shew that the Supposition of the Messiah's having the Name Jehovah given to him, *because* of his *personating* Jehovah, or being his *Representative* in Transactions with Men, is allowable, and even necessary: Let it be considered, that *without* this Supposition, we cannot so well account for the Scriptures stiling him both *Angel of Jehovah*, and *Jehovah*, sometimes *one*, and sometimes the *other*, *promiscuously* and *indifferently*: *Without* it, we make the *Most High* visibly to appear, and perform a ministerial Part; to act in the Quality or Capacity of an *Angel*; which even to imagine, the Ancients did not scruple to pronounce equally *impious* and *absurd*[a]. Yea, and *without it* (as is strongly argued in the Modest Plea, *p*. 274, 275.) we either unavoidably *confound* Christ with the *Father*, or *multiply Jehovahs*, and set up more than one. 'If *Jehovah* (says the 'learned Author) or ὁ ὢν, be not the Name of a '*Nature* or *Substance*, but the Name of HIM, [of 'the Person] whose that Nature or Substance is; and 'if that *He* be God the Father, (as it must needs be, 'if the Father was at all the *God of the* Jews;) and 'if the Word *He* cannot signify more Persons than 'one, at one and the same Time; it follows necessa-

'rily

[a] *Vid.* Observations on Dr. *Waterland*'s second Defence: Observation 4, *p*. 38.

'rily and evidently, that to affirm the Son to be *Jehovah*, or ὁ ὢν (any otherwise than as being the *Representative* of the invisible Father) is affirming either that he is the *Father himself*, or else that there is more than one *Jehovah*, or ὁ ὢν. Nor does the supposing him to be *consubstantial*, make any Difference at all in this Case. For he who is *consubstantial* with *Jehovah*, is not consequently the *Jehovah* with whom he is consubstantial: But if he is stiled *Jehovah* at all, he is either so stiled upon Account of his being his *Representative*; or else all that can follow from the Supposition of *Consubstantiality* is, that there will be two *Jehovahs* [two οἱ ὄντες] in *one Substance*. Most erroneous, therefore, is your Assertion, that the Son is himself ὁ ὢν, as being *consubstantial* with the Father. For being *consubstantial* with *Him*, who is ὁ ὢν, will no more make him to be himself ὁ ὢν; than being consubstantial with the *Father*, will make him to be *himself* the *Father*. Our Readers, not we ourselves, must judge of this Reasoning; but, to the best of my Apprehension, it is *perfect Demonstration*.' See also upon this Head, of Christ's being called *Jehovah*, Dr. *Clarke*'s Reply to *Nelson*, p. 161, 162, 163, 164. And a Confut. of Mr. *Moore*'s 5th Prop. *p*. 34.

My Letter has offered still more Proof of an Inconsistence and Irreconcilableness between the *Athanasian* Doctrine of the Trinity, and that of *Scripture*, resulting from the numerous Texts, which affirm the *Son* and Spirit to be both of them *from* the *Father*, and to act in all Things by his Mission, Authority, and Will, *p*. 6. That there really are Texts in the New Testament of *such an* Import, and not *a few*; the Collections of them made by Dr. *Clarke* in his Script. Doctrine, will undeniably shew, Part I. Chap. 2. §. 5. Chap. 3. §. 6. Likewise Part III. Sections 34, 35, 36, and 40, 41. In Agreement with which, the learned Bishop *Pearson* brings numerous Testimonies of Fathers, and ancient Doctors of the Church, who

who have not ſtuck to call God, even the Father, the *Origin*, the *Cauſe*, the *Author*, the *Root*, the *Fountain*, and the *Head* of the *Son*; or the whole Divinity. So Biſhop *Bull* tells us, 'That *all* the Ancients, 'without *Fear*, pronounced him *Principium*, *Cauſa*, '& *Autor Filii*; Ἀρχὴ, Αἰτία, & Ἄιτιον τοῦ εἶναι; 'the Principle or Spring, the Cauſe, the Author of 'the Son, the Cauſe of his Being[a].' The ſame learned Writer expreſly grants too, That in the Senſe of the Ancients, and his own Opinion, 'The Son re-'ceiv'd both his *Perſon* and *Deity* from the Father, 'Sect. 4. Chap. 1. §. 7.' Nay, even Mr. *Anonymous* ſays, 'We never deny that *They*, meaning the *Son* 'and *Spirit*, are of and from *Him*, viz. the *Father*. 'Many of us have called him the *Fountain of the* '*Trinity*, p. 4.' Again, 'The Queſtion is not whether 'the *Son* be *of* the *Father*, and the *Spirit from* the '*Father* and the *Son*: Theſe we believe with the 'Scripture, *p.* 5.' Again, *p.* 6. 'We aſcribe *Aſeity*, or 'Self-Exiſtence, to the Perſon of the Father *only*. 'He *only* is of himſelf *unoriginate*, and of and from 'no other. The Perſon of the *Son* is of the *Fa-*'*ther*, and not of himſelf; and the *Holy Ghoſt* is not 'of himſelf, but of and from the *Father* and the '*Son*.' Now this ſeems to me utterly irreconcilable to the Notion of the Sacred Three being *co-equal* amongſt themſelves. From hence, I think, we fairly and neceſſarily collect a certain *Superiority* in the *Father*, above the *Son* and *Spirit*; and a *Subordination* in *them* to *him*. In general, therefore, (ſays Biſhop *Pearſon*, p. 34.) we may ſafely obſerve, 'That in 'the very Name of *Father*, there is ſomething of '*Eminence*, which *is not* in that of the *Son*. And 'ſome Kind of Priority we muſt aſcribe unto him 'whom we call the Firſt, in reſpect of him whom 'we term the Second Perſon; and as we can't but 'aſcribe it, ſo we muſt endeavour to preſerve it. 'We muſt not ſo far involve ourſelves in the 'Darkneſs

[a] Defenſ. Fid. Nic. Sect. 4. Cap. 2.

'Darkness of this Mystery [*i. e.* the Trinity] as to 'deny the *Glory* which is clearly due unto the Father, whose Pre-eminence undeniably consisteth in 'this, that He is *God*, not of any other, but of '*Himself*; and that there is no other Person who is 'God, but is *God* of *Him*. It is no Diminution to 'the Son, to say he is from another, for his very '*Name* imports as much; but it were a Diminution 'to the Father, to speak so of *Him*: And there 'must be some Pre-eminence where there is Place for 'Derogation. *What* the *Father* is, He is from *none*: 'What the *Sone* is, He is from the *Father*. What 'the First is, He giveth: What the Second is, He 'receiveth. The First is a *Father* indeed, by Reason 'of his *Son*; but He is not *God*, by Reason of *Him*. 'Whereas the *Son* is not so only in Regard of the '*Father*, but also *God*, by Reason of the same.' The like Acknowledgment we have from Professor *Turretine*, Vol. I. p. 309. 'Quædam ὑπεροχὴ tribuitur 'Patri in subsistendo, quia & quoad ordinem, & 'quoad *originem* præcedit Filium & Spiritum Sanctum, utpote qui nullum habeat, vel ordinis vel originis principium, sed a seipso sit; quo sensu a Patribus dicitur πηγαία Θεότητος, Fons Deitatis.' So Dr. *Watts* tells us, 'In the Language of the *Primitive* 'Christians, and in the avowed Declarations of *Athanasian* Writers, Christ is denied the *Dignity* of Self-'Existence, and is declared to derive both his *real* '*Existence*, and his *Godhead*, his *Power*, and *all* his '*Glory* from the Father; and that, as the Ancients 'assert, by the Father's *Will* too; though this Will 'is sometimes construed into a mere Acquiescence. 'Now these diminutive Characters and Properties 'seem a little to *diminish* the Lustre, and *degrade* the 'Supreme Dignity of the Godhead of Christ. Dissertations, Part II. p. 109.' And to me it is exceeding clear, that if *any one* derives his *Existence*, or *Essence*, from *another*, *whatsoever* the *Mode*, the *Manner*, and Way of the Derivation may be; He is, with

with respect to *Original* at least, *inferior* to that other. Accordingly the Ancients, when they explain that Text, *John* xiv. 28. The Father is *greater* than I. Generally confess it to belong to Christ in his pre-existent Nature, *before* his Incarnation; and *because* the *Father* is the *Principle* and *Origin* of the *Son*, therefore they say He is greater, *Idem*, p. 73. No Doubt if in *this*, or any Respect else, the *Father* is greater, or superior to the *Son*; in the same Respect the *Son* is less, or inferior to the *Father*. And a late Author of a large Body of Divinity [Dr. *Thomas Ridgley*] was so very sensible of the Force of the Argument, for an *Inferiority* or *Subordination* in the *Son* and *Spirit*, drawn from the Texts which affirm the *one* to be generated, begotten, of the *Father*; and the *other* to proceed from *him*; that he takes Occasion to enquire whether there mayn't be another Sense than the common one put upon these Texts, less liable to Exception, as well as more intelligible. And he labours to shew, that they ought to be expounded not of *Nature*, but of *Office*, Vol. I. p. 125. Dr. *Watts* too says, 'Though it has been an Opinion generally receiv'd, that the Sonship of Christ belongs to his Divine Nature, supposing it to be really derived from the Father by eternal Generation, yet the Scripture does no where affirm this Doctrine, but 'tis drawn only by supposed Consequences; and there are (adds the Doctor) many zealous Trinitarians and learned Writers in our Days, who suppose no Derivation of one Person from another in pure Godhead, *lest it infer* some *Inferiority* in the Person *derived*; and therefore they explain *Christ's Sonship* rather to signify the peculiar Derivation of his Soul and Body from God the Father, or his being constituted the Messiah by the Decree and Appointment of God.' Dissertations, Part I. p. 16, 17. Again, 'If the Sonship of Christ does not belong to his Godhead, even when he is called the *Son of God*, but belongs rather to his *Office*, as Mediator, or

'to the Derivation of his human Nature, both Soul 'and Body, from God the Father, in a peculiar and 'extraordinary Way; then, wherefoever he is repre-'fented as a Son (whether as Son of God, or Son of 'Man) ftill his Sonfhip is an inferior Part of his Cha-'racter, and, on this Account, we may expect many 'Things afferted or denied concerning him, which 'cannot properly be afferted or denied concerning his 'fupreme Nature, or Godhead, which has nothing 'in itfelf fo much *derivative* and *dependent* as feems 'to be implied in the Word *Son*,' p. 42, 43. Again, 'In feveral Texts, there are fome Expreffions 'which feem to reprefent *Him* (namely Chrift) even 'in his *pre-exiftent* State, *below* the Dignity of God-'head: As when he is called the *Son of God*, and 'faid to be *begotten of the* Father, which feems to 'denote too much *Derivation* and *Dependence* for *pure* '[I take Leave to add fupreme] Deity; and, by 'Confequence, Equality with the Father.' Part II. p. 11. Mr. *Slofs* alfo, in his Volume of Sermons on the Doctrine of the Trinity, fays, 'That to explain 'the *Generation* of the *Son of* God, by the Father's '*communicating* to him his *Effence*, or his *Nature*, and '*Perfections*, is a Way of fpeaking, which gives great 'Handle to the Adverfaries; that it infers the *De-'pendence* of the Son on the Father; and, indeed, to 'draw it out to all its Confequences, would degrade 'Him to the Level of a *Creature*.——A DERIV'D 'Being, or a Perfon who is not SELF-ORIGINATED, 'is juft, in other Words, a *dependent Creature*.' Vid. p. 271, 272, 277, 278, *& alib.*

As to the Son and Spirit's acting in all Things by the Miffion and Authority of the Father, Mr. *Anonymous* can by no Means agree to it. 'This, fays he, 'is *not true*, p. 5. for it does not appear, that the 'Son and Spirit acted in the *Creation* of all Things 'by his Authority, or that *either* of them was fent, 'or were delegated hereunto.' But what a Number of *Texts* does Dr. *Clarke* bring in his Scripture Doc-

trine to prove this, Part II. Sections 35, 36. which one can hardly forbear suspecting Mr. *A*——*s* has never read, or not attended to as he ought. And this appear'd with so bright Evidence to the most ancient and learned Fathers, that it is their current Doctrine. See Quotations, to make good what I now assert, in Scripture Doctrine, *p.* 324, *&* *seq.* And in Christian Liberty asserted, *p.* 81, *&* *seq.* The Author of which latter Book undertakes to shew, 'That the 'Ancients, in their Explication of *John*, i. 3. All 'Things were made *by* [διὰ through] Him, unani-'mously understood the Word, or Christ, to be the '*ministerial* Agent, who in the Creation of the 'World acted in Subordination and Obedience to the 'Will and Command of the Father.' So in the Essay towards a Demonstration of the Scripture Trinity, the learned Author tells us, 'This *secondary* '*Efficiency*, or Ministration of the Son to the Father, 'in the Work of Creation, is not only maintained by 'the Fathers, but *argued* from the Preposition διὰ, 'which they reckon expressive of the τὸ ὑπηρέτικον τοῦ 'υἱοῦ,' *p.* 120. Likewise Bp. *Bull*, as cited and translated by Dr. *Clarke*, Script. Doct. *p.* 332. 'God *commanded*, 'saith he, his Word to make the World, *i. e.* He '*willed*, that the World should be made by his 'Word, the Will of the Word himself concurring 'therein.' Again, 'That the Father, as the *chief* 'Author, giving his *Commands*, created all Things 'by his Son executing the Commands and Will of 'the Father, is so far from being *Arian*, that even 'those Catholick Writers who lived *after* the Coun-'cil of *Nice*, and were the most earnest Opposers of 'the *Arian* Heresy, made no Scruple to affirm it 'generally in their Writings.' Nay, Dr. *Waterland* owns, 'That the *general Opinion* of the *Ancients* cen-'ter'd in this; that the Father, as *Supreme*, issued 'out *Orders* for the *Creation* of the Universe, and 'the Son executed them,' First Defence, *p.* 184. And *p.* 188. 'A Man must be a *very Stranger* to the

'Ancients,

'Ancients, who can make any Question, whether 'they attributed the Work of Creation to the Son, 'as much as to the Father. They ascribed it *equally* 'to both: Only with this *Difference*, as before ob-'served, that for the greater *Majesty and Dignity of* 'the *Father*, as the first Person, they supposed him 'to issue *out Orders*, or to give *His* FIAT for the 'Creation, and the Son to execute.' To which may be added what Dr. *Watts* observes in his Book of the Trinity, *p.* 191. 'That God the Fa-'ther is represented, in Scripture, generally as the '*First*, or *Supreme* Agent, but as acting *by* his Word, 'or Son, and *through* his Spirit, and that sometimes 'in the Works of *Creation* and *Providence*, as well 'as in the Works of *Redemption and Salvation*. In 'CREATION, this is sufficiently evident. *Psalm* 'xxxiii. 2. By the Word of the Lord were the Hea-'vens made, and all the Host of them by the Breath '[or Spirit] of his Mouth. *Ephes.* iii. 9. God who 'created all Things *by* Jesus Christ. *Heb.* i. 2. By 'whom, *i. e.* his *Son*, he made the Worlds. The 'Spirit also hath his Share of Agency herein. Thus, '*Job* xxvi. 13. By his Spirit he garnished the Hea-'vens. And his Spirit moved on the Face of the 'Waters, *Gen.* i. 2.' Now if it be *true*, that the *Son* and *Spirit* act in *all* Things (as I have asserted) by the Mission and Will of the *Father*, this is never to be reconciled, I humbly conceive, with the Notion of their having a *perfect full* Equality with *Him*. And it is upon some *Pre-eminence* in the Father, as Bishop *Pearson* judiciously observes, *p.* 36. (*viz.* the Pre-eminence he is speaking of before, the Father's being God, not *of any other*, but of himself) that we may safely ground the *Congruity* of the *Divine Mis-sion*. 'We often read, that Christ *was* sent, whence 'He bears the Name of an *Apostle*, as well as those 'of his Disciples, who were called by that Name; 'because, as the Father sent Him, so sent He them. 'The Holy Ghost is also said to be sent.—— But we

'no where read this of the *Father*: There being an '*Authority* in that Name, which seems *inconsistent* 'with *Mission*.'

I may here appositely enough, I think, introduce a very just and weighty Remark of Dr. *Clarke*, Script. Doct. *p.* 324. 'That the Texts which mention 'Christ's being sent, or given, by the Father, are to 'be understood, not of Christ, considered *partially* in 'his *human State*, but, of his *whole* Person, in every 'Capacity; which appears (says he) from hence: 'That the Spirit, who never was incarnate, is yet no 'less usually declared to be *given* or *sent*; and that 'our Lord is not only affirmed to be sent in *the Flesh*, 'but also sent to take our Flesh upon Him, to 'take *Part of Flesh* and *Blood*, and to *be made Flesh*; 'which can be properly spoken only of one, who 'existed before his actual Incarnation.' Well: But still it may be pleaded (I am aware) by *Athanasian* Writers, that the Son and Spirit's being represented under Characters of Inferiority, and their being said to be delegated from, or to *minister* to the Father, is far from proving their Inequality as *to Essence*: For this is to be accounted for, they imagine, by a certain *Priority* and *Posteriority of Order* between the Sacred Three, with respect to *Subsistence*: And especially by what is termed an *Oeconomy*, or *Dispensation*, *voluntarily agreed* upon, and *settled between themselves*[a]. Thus, as to the Passages 1 *Cor.* viii. 6. To us one is God, even the Father, of whom are all Things, *&c.* *Ephes.* iv. 6. One God and Father of all, *&c.* 'These 'Passages, says Mr. *Anonymous*, speak of the Per-'sons of the Trinity according to the *Dispensation* 'of Redemption, in which the *Father* sustains the 'Honour and Majesty of the Deity, and the *other* '*Two* condescend to act ministerially, one as the Re-'deemer, the other the Sanctifier of his People. Post-script,

[a] Dr. *Watts*'s 4th Dissertation, *p.* 87. where he is mentioning the Attempts of learned Authors amongst the *Athanasians* to solve and remove Difficulties attending their Scheme.

'ſcript, *p.* 4.' Again, ſame Page; 'As for the *peculiar high Titles* and *Epithets* beſtowed on the *Father*, I call upon him to ſhew ſo much as one which 'is not purely perſonal, or given, with reſpect to the 'Diſpenſation of Redemption.' Again, 'If it were 'univerſally true (*viz.* that the *Son* and *Spirit* act by 'the *Father*'s Miſſion, Authority, and Will) the Order of their Subſiſtence and Operation, or the Diſpenſation of Redemption might ſatisfy us of the 'Reaſon,' *p.* 5. This *Order* and *Oeconomy* the Reader muſt note is the dernier Reſort of Mr. *Anonymous*, as indeed all *Athanaſian* Writers: And it may not be amiſs to tranſcribe here ſome Poſitions concerning it advanced by a Champion Writer, which I queſtion whether they can be parallel'd. 'Difference of '*Order*, makes no Difference of *Power*, or *Godhead*. 'All that remains peculiar to the Father, is, a Pre-'eminence, or Priority of *Order*, an Eminence of '*Order*, an Inequality of Order, a natural *Order* of 'Priority, a natural *Priority of Order*, an Authority 'of Order, and Sim. And the Father (ſays he) is in '*Office* ſuperior by *mutual Concert and Agreement*. 'Supremacy of *Office*, by mutual Agreement, and '*voluntary Oeconomy*, belongs to the Father. He 'that *ſends*, is for that Reaſon greater than He that 'is *ſent*; greater, in reſpect of *Office* voluntarily *en-'ter'd into*. The Son is an *Angel* and Meſſenger, not 'by Nature, but by *Office*, and by *voluntary Con-'deſcenſion*. Who ever ſaid, that it was abſolutely or 'phyſically impoſſible for the *Father* to *act as the Son 'did?* All that is ſaid, is, that He could not do it '*ſuitably*. The Subjection of the Son does not ne-'ceſſarily mean any Thing more than that *voluntary* '*Oeconomy* which God the Son underwent, and which 'would not have been *proper* for the Father himſelf 'to have ſubmitted to, becauſe not ſuitable to the '*Order of Perſons*. As to the Son's acting a *miniſte-'rial* Part, that, indeed, is purely *Oeconomical* [found-'ed merely upon mutual Concert and Agreement]

 'and

'and there was no *Impossibility* in the Nature of the 'Thing, but the *Father* himself might have done 'the *same*. But it was more congruous, *&c.*' These Positions (with others of like Sort) are cited from Dr. *Waterland*'s Second Defence of his Queries, by the Author of Observations on that Defence: Who, besides *citing*, has largely *refuted*, and *exposed* them, as they deserve: Proving against the Doctor (in my Apprehension) with great Clearness and Strength, 'That 'his Priority of Order, not *Oeconomical*, but *Natural*, 'is a Priority in NOTHING except mere Words, and 'in no Respect any *real* Priority at all: Likewise, 'that a Supremacy of Authority and Dominion, not '*Natural*, but merely *Oeconomical*, founded on bare '*voluntary Agreement*, and *mutual Concert*, is no Su-'premacy of Authority and Dominion at all.' *Vid.* p. 24.——38. And a good deal more has been published, particularly with relation to the *Oeconomy*, since those Observations upon it, and with the same View; to make Mankind sensible, that it is quite a Novel Hypothesis, purely fictitious and chimerical, and one of the worst Things in Divinity that ever was invented or broached. Let me quote a few Passages out of Farther Remarks on Dr. *Waterland*'s Farther Vindication of Christ's Divinity, and Memoirs of his Life and Writings. The Author of the First says thus, *p.* 22, 23. 'Dr. *Waterland* having reduced 'to nothing the natural and real Supremacy of the 'one *God and Father of all*, who is *above all*, which 'is the Foundation of the *Unity*, and the first Prin-'ciple both of natural and revealed Religion; in-'stead of it, he sets up a *figurative*, *imaginary*, and 'merely *theatrical* Supremacy, which he calls a Su-'premacy of *Office*, and *Oeconomical*; and by a mere 'Fiction founds it in a supposed Agreement and Con-'cert between the Father and the Son; wherein the 'Son consents (though equal in *Authority* and *Power* 'with the *Father*) to act a ministerial Part for a while, 'to be the Father's Minister and Agent, and execute

'his

'his Orders, and at last become incarnate.——I refer 'it to any reasonable or serious Person to consider, 'whether such Scheme be [Part of] the Religion of 'Christ taught in the Scriptures, and professed by 'the Primitive Church.' Again, *p.* 28. 'The Ex-'istence of the Son is no more *precarious*, than Dr. '*W.* makes the Supremacy of the one God and Fa-'ther of all, who is above all, (pardon the Shock-'ingness of the Expression) *precarious*; who teach-'eth that what he absurdly calls the *Supremacy* of '*Office*, and which is the *only* Supremacy of Domi-'nion which, according to him, the Father has, or 'can have, is merely *Oeconomical*, not *Natural*, or *Es-'sential*; that it depends on the *voluntary Agreement* 'of the *Son*, and, in the Nature of Things, was 'possible not to have been at all, and may cease to 'be: Nay, on the contrary, that the *Son* might have 'had the Supremacy, and the *Father* have *acted the 'ministerial Part*, have received and obeyed the Or-'der of the *Son*, been *incarnate*, and passible. And 'in Consequence of this Oeconomy (if there is any 'Thing in Dr. *Waterland*'s Reasoning from the sup-'posed Precariousness of the Son) the one God and 'Father of all, who is above all, might have been 'so *precarious*, as that the *Son* would have been to 'the Father (which the Ancients, agreeably to Scrip-'ture, affirm the Father to be to the *Son*) his *Ruler*, 'his *Lord*, and his *God*.' And Memoirs, *p.* 95. 'Dr. '*Waterland* has two Senses (give me Leave to call 'them so at present) in which he owns the Father to 'be *greater* than the *Son* and *Spirit*; the one is, his 'being greater in *Natural Order*, the other in *Oecono-'mical Office*, i. e. as he frequently explains it, greater 'by *mere Concert*, and the Son's *voluntary Agreement* 'to take the *ministerial Office* upon him, which ne-'vertheless the *Father* might have taken upon Him-'self, and so have been less than the Son. With 'him the Supremacy of God is not any *natural Do-'minion*, but a *mere Office*, held by the Consent of

'the

'the *Son* and *Spirit*, and might equally have been 'allotted unto them. Is not this ſpecial Divinity? 'Or can it be named or thought on without ſhocking 'the Ears and Underſtanding of every intelligent 'and ſincere Chriſtian? Yet this is the Eſſence of 'Dr. *Waterland*'s Orthodoxy; it is the Beginning, 'Middle, and End of it: But to call it the Doctrine 'of the Church, is ſuch an Affront to the Body of 'Chriſtians, as is not to be endured[a].' I will add here one Paſſage of the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, which to me appears to *contradict*, in the ſtrongeſt Manner, the aforeſaid *pretended Oeconomy*, and is utterly *irreconcilable* herewith, 1 *Cor.* xv. 24, 27, 28. Then cometh the *End*, when he ſhall have *delivered up the Kingdom to* God, even the Father. For he hath put all Things under his Feet. But when he ſaith all Things are put under Him, it is manifeſt, He is excepted which did put all Things under Him. And when all Things ſhall be ſubdued unto Him, then ſhall the Son alſo Himself be ſubject unto him that put all Things under Him, that God may be all in all. Then ſhall the Son alſo be ſubject; namely, when the End of the World is come; after the Duration of the *ſuppoſed Oeconomy* is *expired*, and the mediatorial diſpenſatory Kingdom (as it is term'd) *deliver'd up:* Then ſhall the Son be ſubject; Unto whom? Why, unto Him who put all Things under Him, God, even the Father: That *He* may be all in all. The Reader will find it worth while to ſee on this Text *Emlyn*'s Tracts, *p.* 7, *& ſeq.* Obſervations on *Waterland*'s Second Defence, *p.* 14, *& ſeq.* And Dr. *Whitby*'s laſt Thoughts, *p.* 54, 55, 56. to balance what is aſſerted by him in his Commentaries.

Having by this Time (I hope) ſufficiently cleared and vindicated the *ſecond* Reaſon given in my Letter for diſbelieving the *Athanaſian* Doctrine of the Trinity, namely, the *Repugnancy* or *Contrariety* of the ſaid Doctrine

[a] *Vid. Etiam* p. 33, 65, 118. And Chriſtian Liberty aſſerted, *p.* 38, 39, 59.

'of *Certainty*; that if there can be *Three* neceſſarily 'exiſting Perſons, exiſting, as you affirm, by the *ſame* 'Neceſſity of Nature, and having *all the ſame eſſen-* 'tial *Perfections*, Reaſon, which ſhews the Evidence, 'Certainty, and Demonſtration of one, and no 'more, muſt be reduced itſelf to an Abſurdity and 'Contradiction. Surely it is Demonſtration that the 'Exiſtence of but *One* All-perfect, All-ſufficient Per- 'ſon, Being, or Agent, can be *neceſſary* [and you 'ſuppoſe not any Perfection to be in one of the Per- 'ſons, which is not in the others, denying Unoriginate- 'neſs, which in *Words*, but not in *Reality*, as we ſhall 'ſee, you aſcribe to the *Father* only, to be a Perfec- 'tion, Second Defence, *p.* 150.] Therefore it is De- 'monſtration, that there can be no more than *One*.'

2. Does not Reaſon loudly reclaim againſt the Communication of *any Thing individual* (be it *Nature*, *Eſſence*, *Attributes*, or *Perfections*) from one Perſon, to two, or more; ſo as that the Thing communicated ſhall belong to, and be predicated of, *each* of theſe Perſons, in the *ſame numerical* Senſe? The Author of the Reply therefore, to Dr. *Waterland*'s 9th Query, Whether the Divine Attributes, *Omniſcience*, *Ubiquity*, &c. thoſe very *individual* Attributes can be communicated without the Divine Eſſence from which they are inſeparable? To this Query, ſays he, it is evidently a ſufficient Anſwer, to obſerve, 'That *Indi-* 'vidual *Attributes* can neither be communicated *with*, 'nor *without* the Eſſence; becauſe the *Communication* 'of an *Individual*, without the *Communicator*'s part- 'ing with it, is ſuppoſing it not to be *an Individual*, 'and is conſequently a Contradiction in Terms, *p.* '300.' So, in Anſwer to the Author of Some Conſiderations, 'tis rightly obſerved, in like Manner, *p.* 230. 'That the Reaſon why the *Individual* Know- 'ledge, or Power of God cannot be *communicated* 'any more than his *Individual Exiſtence* [or *Eſſence*] 'is, becauſe They are *Individual*, and nothing that 'is *Individual* can ever be *communicated* from any

'one Person to another. Could the *Individual* Knowledge of God, or the *Individual* Knowledge of a Man be *communicated* to another, there would be no Knowledge left in him from whom it was communicated.' Let me add here, that the Unreasonableness and Absurdity of one Person's communicating to others his *Individual* Nature, and Attributes, is extreamly heighten'd, upon Supposition of the Communicator's being *unoriginate*, or *self-existent*, and those to whom he communicates it *not*: Accordingly to expose this Notion as it deserves, the foresaid Author of the Reply demands, *p.* 302. 'Is not *Self-Existence* an Attribute of God the Father? And are not all the Attributes of God the Father *unoriginated?* How then can the Son have the *Individual* Essence and Attributes of the Father, and yet not be *unoriginate?* In reality your Assertion is downright *Sabellianism*, making the Son to be not ὁμοούσιος, but ταυτοούσιος, and ὁμουπόστατος with the Father; nay, to be *Father himself.* For what is the *individual Essence* and *Attributes* of the Father, but the *Father himself?* If the Son, therefore, as you affirm, has both these, He is plainly the Father; or else, What is it that distinguishes the Son from the Father? If you say the *personal Attributes*, then you destroy your first Assertion. For the *personal Attributes* of the Father, being unquestionably the *individual Attributes* of the *Father*, the Son, according to your own Argument, must either have these *personal individual Attributes* of the Father, or else not have the individual Essence.' See also what is said by the Author of the Essay towards a Demonstration of the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, *p.* 35, 36. who there lays it down as an *Axiom*, 'That an *individual* Perfection can't be predicated of *two real distinct* Persons (one *underived*, the other *derived*) though they may each of them possess a Perfection of the *same Name*, ex. gr. *Wisdom.* Suppose *A* and *B* two such Persons; the individual Wisdom

'of *A* can't be predicated of *B*; becauſe *A*'s Wiſ-
'dom is underived, but *B*'s derived [for without
'Doubt, the Attributes are derivative, in the ſame
'Senſes as the Eſſence is. Dr. *Waterland*'s Defence,
'*p.* 108. And every Perfection of a derived Perſon
'muſt be derived, as well as its Exiſtence, *p.* 32.]
'Now if *A* and *B* be both of them poſſeſſed of the
'ſame individual Wiſdom, it muſt be at once both
'*derived*, and *underived*, which is abſurd to aſſert
'of the ſame *individual* Perfection. Corollary: If
'*A* and *B* be diſtinct Perſons, they can never have
'the ſame *numerical* Perfections, though they may
'poſſeſs the ſame ſpecifical ones.'

Thus I have pointed out ſome of the Difficulties, as to *Reaſon*, attending the *Athanaſian* Hypotheſis, or the Doctrine of the Trinity above laid down; and, in my Opinion, theſe Difficulties are unſurmountable. The Reader will find more ſuch, if he conſults Collection Queries, *p.* 130, 144. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. *Waterland*, p. 57. Dr. *Whitby*'s laſt Thoughts, *p.* 6, 7, *&* *ſeq.* Addreſs to Proteſtant Diſſenters to put them upon enquiring into the Grounds of their Attachment to the Aſſembly's Catechiſm, *p.* 7, *&* *ſeq.*

But 'twill be ſaid, perhaps, What has *human Reaſon* to do in a Point of ſuch a Nature as the *Trinity?* Is not this a Doctrine of *pure Revelation*, and a very ſublime Myſtery? Although it be incomprehenſible by us, and may puzzle our Reaſon, and put it to a Non-plus, we ought, notwithſtanding, to yield an Aſſent to it upon the Teſtimony of the Revealer. 'As for Reaſon (ſays Mr. *Anonymous*) it has no Buſi-
'neſs here, but to enquire whether this be revealed.
'If it is, Reaſon ought to make no Objections, no
'Demur againſt this ſelf-evident Truth, what God
'ſays is true. There is no Reaſon for aſking how,
'or why it is ſo, after God has revealed it is ſo. Our
'Reaſon is not the Meaſure of Truth. There are
'many Things above our Reaſon to underſtand,

'which are, and must, yea, and are confessed to be 'undeniably true, *p.* 6.' To this I reply, from the Modest Plea, in Chap. 4. p. 40. where the Author treats of *Reason*, in the Question about the Trinity. 1. That 'I am free to grant, that whatever the 'Scriptures do teach, be it ever so much above our 'Comprehension, is to be believed. 'Tis a sufficient 'Demonstration of any Truth, that God hath said 'it: Nor would any Man, who knows what he 'says, or does, dispute what God has revealed. 'Tis 'certainly reasonable to believe what is above our 'Comprehension. But then we must not mistake '*Contradictions* for *Mysteries*, nor put off Schemes 'and Inventions of *our own*, for the Revelations of '*God*. We must not confound Things above our 'Comprehension with Things which we clearly con-'ceive to be impossible, and thus captivate Reason, 'not to Revelation, but to the Follies of Men. '2. 'Tis granted, that we cannot comprehend the 'Nature of the self-existent and infinitely perfect 'God. Yet notwithstanding that, we are able to 'comprehend what may be a *Contradiction* to it, as 'clearly as if we really could comprehend it. That 'one Substance cannot be three Substances, is as 'clearly comprehensible as if we had Faculties which 'could descry what the Nature of Substances is. 'That *one* and the *same* Being cannot be *derived* and '*underived*, *begotten* and *unbegotten*, is as clear as that 'tis impossible to be, and not to be, at the same 'Time. In short, whatever is a Contradiction in the 'Nature of Things, must always be equally a Con-'tradiction, let it be applied to a Being whose Nature 'we can, or cannot comprehend. For our *Ignorance* 'no more alters the Nature of a Contradiction, than 'our *Knowledge* does. Notwithstanding, therefore, 'that our Faculties are such as are not qualified to 'form any tolerable Ideas of the Substance of God, 'yet they certainly are such as can perceive, very 'clearly, Ideas *contradictory* to it. Natural Reason

'discovers

'discovers a great many Attributes and Properties of 'the Divine Being, and Revelation has confirm'd the 'Truth of those Discoveries. Whatever, therefore, 'is a Contradiction to any of these Attributes, may 'be as justly determined to be so by Men, notwith-'standing the Narrowness of their Capacities, as if 'they had much superior Faculties. 3. Where-ever 'a Man clearly perceives the Agreement or Disagree-'ment of Ideas, 'tis unreasonable to expect he should 'quit such Evidence, and resign his *Sense*, or Under-'standing, to what may groundlesly be called by some 'a Matter of *Faith*. *The Meaning of* Words must 'be judged of by Reason, unless God himself should 'so far interpose, as to discover their Signification.— 'If a Word, therefore, be plainly ambiguous, we 'must compare other Passages of Scripture, and re-'concile them together in the most *rational* Manner 'we can, as being certain that an All-wise God will 'reveal nothing that is absurd or contradictory. If 'the Interpretation of a Word in one particular Sense, 'in some Places, will make the *Whole* of Revelation '*easy* and *intelligible*; but by confining it constantly 'to another particular Sense, will make the *Whole* ei-'ther *absurd* or *unintelligible*; we may safely con-'clude, that the Wisdom of God designed such 'Term in those Places to be understood in such a 'Manner, as would not make Men renounce their 'Reason.' Hear too what Mr. *Colliber* says upon the Question, how far the Judgment of Reason extends with Reference to the Proofs and Contents of a Revelation, Essays on Natural and Revealed Religion, *p.* 58, *& seq.* After having well observed, that ''Tis 'the Privilege of Reason to enquire both into the 'History and Nature of the external Proofs: To 'judge concerning the Genius of the Language, the 'Nature of the Stile, and Propriety and Connexion 'of the Words wherein the Revelation is made: To 'judge of the Truth, Consistence, and Connexion of 'the Ideas signified by the Terms or Words: He

'adds,

'adds, and 'tis equally the Privilege of Reason to 'judge and determine (though with the utmost Care 'and Circumspection) concerning the Agreeableness 'or Disagreeableness of the entire Revelation to its '*own clear* and *evident Dictates*. For the clear Dic-'tates of Reason, we may be assured, are such Dis-'coveries of the Divine Nature and Will, as no Re-'velation that is truly divine can be supposed to *con-'tradict* or *repeal*.' So Dr. *Stanhope*'s 2d Sermon at *Boyle*'s Lecture, for 1702. 'Reason and Revelation, 'though two different Lights, yet both come down 'from the same Father of Lights: And, therefore, 'can no more contradict each other, than perfect 'Truth can propagate a Lie, or God deny Himself. 'He then that proves any Doctrine to be contrary to 'Reason, does in Effect, and by necessary Conse-'quence prove, at the same Time, that such Doc-'trine neither was, nor could be, revealed by God. 'And therefore, such Doctrine being destitute of that 'proper Motive of Faith I am contending for, can-'not possibly be a proper Matter of Faith.' To the same Purpose speaks a learned Foreigner, Professor *Roell*, in Dissertation 1st against *Vitringa*, p. 13. 'Quanquam id facile largiar, *multa revelata a Deo 'esse*, & *revelari posse*, quæ *rationis captum superent*, 'h. e. quæ sine Revelatione singulari nunquam asse-'qui Ratio omnibus suis Viribus potuisset & possit, 'atque etiam comprehendere postquam revelata sunt 'plene & plane, & quoad omnem modum nequeat; 'cum multa quoque in iis quæ Ratio ipsa docet ob-'scura sint: Nondum tamen ullis mihi Argumentis 'persuaderi potuit, *revelatum aliquid a Deo esse*, aut '*revelari posse*, *quod sit indubitatis* atque *evidentissimis 'Rationis Dictatis contrarium*; & cum Doctissimo 'Biesterfeldio, insulsum illud effatum, *hoc verum est 'Philosophice*, *falsum Theologice*, *tanquam Veritatis op-'probrium proscribo*. Neque enim ob ejusdem falli '& fallere nescii Dei Auctoritatem idem haberi pro 'vero in Philosophia, & pro falso in Theologia po-

 test,

'teſt, niſi ab eo, qui vel rem eandem a ſeipſa diver-
'ſam eſſe, vel Deum ſibi ipſi contradicere, h. e. men-
'tiri poſſe, impudenter & blaſpheme affirmare, eaque
'ratione omnia humanæ certitudinis fundamenta con-
'vellere velit.'

I come now to the laſt Reaſon aſſigned by me for diſbelieving the *Athanaſian* Doctrine of the Trinity, or what has been ſtated above, namely, that ſuch a Doctrine carries in it too much the *Face* and *Appearance* of *Tritheiſm*; nor am I able to vindicate it from this Charge, which ſure is an Error of the worſt and moſt dangerous Sort, *p.* 6. The Reader, I preſume, ſcarce needs to be told, that the Word Tritheiſm means *three* Gods: And if he is verſed in controverſial Writings with Regard to the Trinity, he well knows, that the Doctrine I am ſpeaking of has been charged, by the Oppoſers of it, with being *tritheiſtick*, as well *really*, as *ſeemingly*, and that over and over, in the ſtrongeſt Terms. Thus, by the Author of the Reply to Dr. *Waterland*'s firſt Defence, *p.* 206. 'Ob-
'ſerve, ſays he to the Doctor, how irrefragably your
'own Argument returns upon your own Head. If
'the Son, a diſtinct Perſon, ſeparate or not ſeparate,
'be truly, and indeed the Supreme God; and if the
'Father be ſo too; what can be plainer than that,
'upon your Hypotheſis, there are two Gods, two
'*Supreme* Gods, as plainly as that one and one are
'two. What mean you then to deny that there are
'two Gods? But you ſay they are conſubſtantial,
'they are undivided in their Subſtance. What
'then? I do not charge you with aſſerting two di-
'vided Subſtances, but I do charge you with hold-
'ing two Gods, two ſupreme Gods, undivided in
'their Subſtance, two real and true conſubſtantial
'ſupreme Gods. This you cannot truly and ſin-
'cerely, you ſhould not otherwiſe deny. To this
'you have never given any Reply: Turn it which
'Way ſoever you will, it is capable of no Reply.
'One *general Subſtance*, one Godhead, one *whatever*

'*elſe*

'*else* you pleaſe, you may aſſert, but *one God* upon 'your Principles, it can no Way be.' So in the ſame Book, *p.* 25, 174, 306, 439, 477. Likewiſe in the Remarks on Dr. *Waterland*'s Second Defence, where the Author is conſidering, whether the three Divine Perſons can [poſſibly] be one God? *p.* 20, *&* *ſeq.* 'Though you might, ſays he, have the Liberty of 'calling all the Divine Perſons together *God*; as all 'human Perſons *Man*; [in which Way of ſpeaking, 'nevertheleſs, the three Divine Perſons are as much '*three* Gods, though all called God in the Abſtract, 'as *many* human Perſons are *many* Men, though all 'called in the Abſtract *Man*;] yet you cannot call 'them, nor can they be literally *one God.* The Rea-'ſon is, becauſe when we ſay *one God*, as *one Man*; 'the Word *God*, as alſo *Man*, is not, and can-'not be conſider'd as an abſtract general Name of 'many Individuals, but neceſſarily denotes ſome one 'particular Perſon, Being, Subſtance, or Agent: So 'that to ſay *three* Divine Perſons are *one* God, is to 'ſay they are one particular, individual, intelligent 'Being or Subſtance, one Agent; that is, really, '*one Perſon*; in like Manner as to ſay, *three* human 'Perſons are *one* Man, is to ſay, they are one indi-'vidual Being, one Perſon, which is a flat Contradic-'tion. And ſo the laſt Reſult of your Notion, of '*three* Perſons being *one* God, is, in common Senſe, 'in Truth and Reality, no other Notion, but that '*three* diſtinct Perſons, three acting Beings, or three 'Agents, is one God, *i. e.* one acting Being, one A-'gent, one Perſon, and no more, which is an evi-'dent Contradiction.' See too, *p.* 25. and farther on, *p.* 35. where he is replying to the Doctor's Hypotheſis of a *Union cloſe enough between the Perſons to make them one God:* 'That no *Union* of Subſtance, 'how *cloſe* and inſeparable ſoever, can make *three* 'Perſons, *three* acting Subſtances, *three* Agents, to 'be one acting Subſtance, or *one* God, is, I think, 'plainly demonſtrable; becauſe it does not make

'them

'them *one* Person, or *one* Agent. In this *Union* you 'yourself allow the *Person*, the *Agency*, the *acting* 'Substance of the Father, not to be that of the *Son*, 'or *Spirit*; whence it is evident, that the Union of 'the acting Substances, or Agents, does not make 'them cease to be *three* acting Substances, *three* A-'gents, but only makes them three *united* acting 'Substances, yet so *distinct* both in *Substance* and '*Agency*, as that *this* Substance, *&c.* is not *that*, nor '*one* the *other*. And nothing in Nature can be more 'evident, than that if *Union* of acting Substance made 'the *three* Persons *one* acting Substance, one in Num-'ber, the *Union* of *Person*, which you yourself define 'to be *intelligent acting* Substance (Second Defence, '*p.* 175.) and which you make to be as *close* and in-'separable as that of the Substance (Second Defence, '*p.* 232.) must for the same Reason make the *three* 'Persons to be *one* Person. And you must be a 'shrewd Man indeed, if you can shew, that *Union* 'of acting Substance can make the *three* Persons *one* 'acting Substance, one in Number; and yet *Union* '*of Person*, i. e. again of acting Substance, as you 'expressly define Person, shall not make the *three* Per-'sons, *one* Person, *one* in Number. Turn this Ar-'gument about in your Thoughts as much you will, 'and call in the Help of all your metaphysical Dis-'tinctions, you will find it every Way unanswerable; 'it is, indeed, obvious and evident Demonstration, 'though I do not find your Adversaries have yet ob-'jected it to you, at least, in these Terms. Sup-'pose *three* human Souls closely and inseparably unit-'ed, yet they are nevertheless *three* human *Souls*, and '*three* Persons, as long as their *personal* Properties; 'their *Intelligence* and *Agency* remain in each distinct; 'so long as they are three distinct Agents.' Such a home Charge of Tritheism is there advanced against the Doctrine of the Trinity stated in the Manner before represented: Nor do I see, for my own Part, how it is possible to vindicate it, as so stated, from

this Charge[a], which, howſoever deſpiſed, or lightly eſteemed, it may be, by Mr. *Anonymous*, is with me a very ſubſtantial *cogent* Reaſon, for renouncing the Doctrine as any Article of my Faith. For can there be a groſſer and worſe Error, than what ſubverts the *firſt* and moſt *fundamental* of *all Religion*, *natural*, and *revealed*, as Tritheiſm notoriouſly doth? *Cheynell*, therefore, ſaith, *p.* 240. 'Truly, it is much 'at one, whether Men do profeſs themſelves *Atheiſts*, 'or *Tritheiſts*; becauſe he who doth believe, that 'there are three Gods, may, when he pleaſes, be-'lieve that there is no God at all.'

Having now gone through, and, I hope, ſufficiently cleared up and vindicated the ſeveral Reaſons that are aſſigned in my Letter, for *diſbelieving* the *above-ſtated* Doctrine of the Trinity: My next Buſineſs be, to do the ſame with Reference to certain *Grounds of Diſlike* to this Doctrine, which are moreover the-

in

[a] Both Bp. *Pearſon* and Dr. *Waterland* frankly declare, that upon the *Autothean* Scheme (*i. e.* ſuppoſing *Unoriginateneſs* and *Self-Exiſtence* to belong to *any beſides* the *Father*) *Tritheiſm* is juſtly chargeable. The Words of the former are theſe, 'If, ſays he, there 'were *more* than *one*, which were from *none*, it could not be de-'nied, but there were more Gods than one. The Origination 'in the Divine Paternity, therefore, hath *anciently* been looked 'upon as the Aſſertion of the Unity,' *p.* 40. on the Creed.' And Dr. *Waterland* ſays, 'Two *unoriginate Divine Perſons, how-'ever otherwiſe inſeparable, would be two Gods, according to the An-'cients*; becauſe, *in that Caſe*, one would not be *of the other*, and '*referred up to him as a Fountain*, or *Head*.' Nay, even a warm *Popiſh* Trinitarian Writer, of whom I ſhall have Occaſion ſoon to ſpeak more, *H. E.* p. 38. acknowledges, 'That to ſay in the 'ſtrict philoſophical, or vulgar Senſe of the Word *Perſons*, *three* '*Perſons*, or *three intelligent Agents are one and the ſame God*, is a 'real and manifeſt Contradiction. *Three Divine Agents are evi-'dently three Gods*.' And is it not notable Reaſoning even of Mr. *A——s*, to prove his own Hypotheſis *tritheiſtick?* 'Each of the 'three (Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt) are Perſons; therefore they '*exiſt*: But whatever exiſts has an *Eſſence*, Nature, or Subſtance. 'What *Eſſence* then hath the Son and Spirit? Is it *infinite*, or '*finite*, *made*, or *unmade?* If *infinite*, here are three infinite Be-'ings,' and, of Conſequence, three Gods. *Vid.* alſo Apoſtles Creed better than the Aſſembly's Catechiſm, *p.* 78, 79. And Mr. *Peirce* on *Philippians*, p. 27.

in set forth. The first is the Doctrine's being strenuously espoused by the *Papists*, and what they, when pressed with the Absurdities attending the monstrous Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, have immediate Recourse to, and find the best Refuge in, *Vid.* p. 6, 7. The Words are, 'And as such Doctrine can't be 'the Object of my Belief, because it is manifestly re-'pugnant to *Scripture* and *Reason* both: So I am the '*more* against it, on Account of its being strenuously 'espous'd by the *Papists*; AND what *they*, when 'pressed, *&c.*' Now, by an unfair mangling of this Sentence, and breaking off here at the Word PAPISTS, Mr. *A——s* would create some Mirth to his Reader by insinuating, that I have conceived a Disgust to the Doctrine of the Trinity, explained after the Way of the *Athanasians*, *purely* upon Account of the *Papists* espousing it, and shewing themselves fond of it as thus explained: Or that I dislike it, forsooth, out of a *Spirit of Opposition* to *these People*; and because *they* are so much *for* it, *I am* resolved to be the more *against* it. But let the Sentence be considered *entire*, as it ought, and, I think, no impartial, candid Reader can interpret it to such a Sense, or understand me to mean in it otherwise than I really do: Namely, that I have a particular Dislike of the Doctrine of the Trinity, according to the Explication aforesaid, not *merely* because of its being espous'd with Strenuousness by People in the Church of *Rome*; but *also*, and *especially*, because of its being very serviceable to *them*, when attack'd by us upon the Head of *Transubstantiation*; affording them a Kind of *Sanctuary*, whither they are wont to retire, and wherein they find the best Shelter and Protection. This seems a Ground of Dislike to the Doctrine very solid and just; and I did not imagine the least Objection would have been made to it by any Body who calls himself a *Protestant*. But Mr. *Anonymous* confidently taxes me with egregious *Falsification* here, and not doing the *Papists* Justice. 'The Doctrine of

'the Trinity, says he, as you have stated it, *p.* 6. is 'so far from being strenuously espoused by *them*, 'that it never was espoused by any one of them in 'this World. Yea, if any one of them should dare 'to espouse it, he would run the Risque of being 'burnt for an Heretick: So that I must charge this 'gross Falshood upon him, as proceeding from Ig-'norance, or deserving a worse Name, *p.* 8.' My stating of the Doctrine in the Page and Paragraph referr'd to, is *thus:* 'Three *Persons*; that is to say, '*three intelligent voluntary Agents, each self-existent*, 'and *independent:* OR *each* having the very *same* '*divine Essence.*' And whether Papists are not Espousers of a Doctrine of the Trinity, tantamount to this; or, though not laid down exactly in the *same* Words and Phrases, yet deliver'd in others, that (according to all Propriety of Speech, and if they have any consistent Meaning) must be deem'd equivalent; is submitted to the Reader's Judgment, after he shall have weighed the following Quotations from two of their Writers. The first is a more *ancient* Writer, and Champion of the Popish Cause, Cardinal *Bellarmine:* Who, besides citing the *Athanasian* Creed, with Marks of a through *Approbation*; and allowing it to the *Praise* of the *Reformed*, that they agreed still with Papists in the Belief of the *Trinity*[a]; advances these Positions, with more of like Sort. 'In Deo est 'Unitas Essentiæ, Trinitas Personarum, p. 390. Es-'sentiam includi in omnibus Tribus verissimum est; 'utinam semper sic erraret Calvinus, p. 377. Essen-'tia Divina *una Numero* est in Patre & communicatur 'Filio. *Eadem* Natura quæ ex se est simpliciter *inde-'pendens* communicatur a Patre Filio. Unde solum 'est Relatio mutua Patris ad Filium, & contra; sed 'sine ulla Dependentia in *esse*.—Inter Personas Divinas 'non potest esse ulla prioritas & posterioritas, cum 'nil habent istæ Personæ nisi Essentiam & Relationem, '&

[a] Adhuc, inquit, in Fide *Trinitatis* cum nobis conveniunt. Lib. de Christo, p. 276.

'& Essentia sit *una eademque in omnibus.* Relationes 'autem id requirunt ut sint simul Natura, p. 393. 'Josias Simclerus defendit *Autusiam Filii*, & sic ex- 'plicat suam Sententiam: Non negamus, inquit, Fi- 'lium habere Essentiam a Deo Patre; sed Essen- 'tiam Genitam negamus: Quæ Sententia Josiæ non 'video cur *Catholica* dicenda non sit, p. 406.' The other is a modern Author, who published a Pamphlet in the Year 1729, with only the initial Letters of his Name, *H. E.* and entitled, An Answer to Mr. *Whiston* and Dr. *Clarke*, concerning the Divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit. He gives several plain undeniable Proofs of his being a *Papist*; and says, *p.* 11. 'It is a Principle of the Catholick Faith, that 'if the Scripture be understood in the Sense, in which 'it was writ, 'tis clear in Scripture, that neither the 'Son, nor the Holy Spirit, is a Creature, and that they 'are properly and strictly the *same* God with the Fa- 'ther. *P.* 6. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are 'three Divine Persons, and one God. *P.* 27. It is 'Blasphemy to deny, that either the Son, or the Spi- 'rit, is the same God with the Father. *P.* 29. The 'Son and the Holy Ghost have the same Godhead, 'the same Goodness, the same Will, the same Know- 'ledge, the same Nature, and all the same absolute 'Attributes with the Father, but they are not *self-* '*existent*, because *God* from *God*: Their Persons, 'their Nature, *i. e.* the Godhead, their actual Being 'or Existence, their Knowledge, their Goodness, 'their Will, their Actions, their Decrees, whatever 'they have, and whatever they do, is derived to 'them from the Father. They are truly God, and 'are therefore infinite, omnipotent, immense: They '*necessarily exist*, they are present in all Places, and 'know all Things, and whatever the Father has 'made, or preserves, he made and preserves through 'them. They are truly God, and have therefore 'the *same* Godhead with the Father; and they are '*equal* to him in it; and though different Persons,

'are

'are yet the ſame God with him. They are truly 'God, and, therefore, if God be a Subſtance, or 'Eſſence (which in the Catholick Senſe of the Words 'is unqueſtionable) they are conſubſtantial, and co-'eſſential with the Father. *P.* 30. The Son and 'Holy Spirit neceſſarily exiſt, but they exiſt neceſſa-'rily from the Father, who *alone is ſelf-exiſtent*, i. e. 'God of himſelf, Good of himſelf, Great of himſelf, 'Immortal from himſelf, Almighty and Infinite from 'himſelf alone; becauſe whatever he is, whatever he 'does, whatever he has, he alone has from himſelf, 'and no other. All this undeniably follows, from 'what every Child is taught in his Catechiſm. *P.* 33. 'Neither the Son, nor the Holy Spirit is ſelf-exiſtent; 'and yet, *it is true*, that *both the Son and the Holy 'Spirit is the ſupreme and ſelf-exiſtent God.*' Again, *p.* 35. He ſpeaks of a Trinity of Divine Perſons, each of which, though not ſelf-exiſtent, is neceſſarily exiſtent, and is the ſupreme and ſelf-exiſtent God. Is not here a Trinity taught and eſpouſed by this Author (though he talks at a very inconſiſtent Rate) amounting to that which I have ſtated in my Letter? It may be pleaded, perhaps, that when the Author calls the Father, Son, and Spirit, *Perſons*, or *Divine Perſons*, the Word is not to be taken in its ordinary Acceptation, to denote intelligent *Subſiſtences or Agents*, which would infer a Plurality of Gods. *P.* 8. 'The 'Word Perſon, ſays he, has a different Signification 'applied to the Trinity, and applied to Creatures. If 'we ſpeak of the *former*, a Perſon is one who has a 'common and undivided Nature with another; or 'it is one, either Father, Son, or Holy Ghoſt, who 'has the Godhead in common with the other two, or 'with each. This may be called the theological or 'religious Uſe of the Word Perſon, *i. e.* a Uſe pe-'culiar to the *Chriſtian Religion.*' *P.* 5. [a] He ſhould have

[a] Quid eſt quæſo Divina Perſona? Perſona, ut de Vocis Origine nihil hic dicamus, *Theologis* æque ac *Philoſophis*, eſt Subſtantia individua,

have ſaid peculiar to *Papiſts*. But what *Idea* then, I pray, are we to affix to the Word? Is it not, as *thus* uſed, a mere empty *Sound*, without any *Signification at* all? A *Perſon* is *one*, 'tis ſaid, who has a common Nature with *another*. I aſk, what ONE, and what OTHER? Is it Being, or is it Spirit, or *Mode*, *Relation*, *Difference*, or one and another *Ignotum quid*: Something we know not what.

Well, but how dare the Papiſts be ſo *wicked* as to preſume to *name* and *compare* together the two Doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Tranſubſtantiation?* Will any of them ſay, that the Proofs offered for both are any Way alike, and much leſs equal? *p.* 8. I anſwer, that my Buſineſs is not to enquire into, and determine the *Wickedneſs* of their ſo doing. 'Tis enough for me if I can eſtabliſh the *Truth of the Fact*: And as to that, I have Vouchers in Readineſs, which ſhall be produced. Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* tells us, 'The Church 'of *Rome* are perpetually objecting to Proteſtants, 'that by the *ſame Reaſon* they believe the Doctrine 'of the Trinity, they *may*, and *muſt*, receive that of 'Tranſubſtantiation.' So Biſhop *Kidder* ſays, 'They 'urge, that we *ought* to admit the *latter*, upon the '*ſame* Grounds on which we admit the *former*, Vol. 'III. *p.* 162.' And the Author of three Letters to Dr. *Clarke* obſerves, in his Preface, 'That the *Romiſh* 'Church (by corrupting and abuſing ſeveral invaluable Truths, eſpecially that of the *Trinity*) maintain, '*ad Hominem*, with *too much* ſeeming Reaſon, the 'Abſurdities and Contradictions of their great Idol 'Tranſubſtantiation. For it will ever be thought 'there is as much Piety in believing againſt *Senſe*, as 'againſt *Reaſon*.' Again, the Author of the Dedication to Collection of Queries, *p.* 9. ſays, 'The Papiſts '*can*, and *do*, perpetually tell us, and tell us with 'Reproach, that according to ſome of our Explica'tions, we maintain as *great* Abſurdities and Contra-

'dictions

dividua, intelligens, per ſe ſubſiſtens, & ab omni alia diſtincta. Roell, Diſſertat. 1. *p.* 27.

'dictions in our Faith, as any we left in their Com-
'munion. They argue, and we are abash'd to hear
'it, that some of our *scholastic* Explications of the
'*Trinity* are as contradictory to *Reason* and the *Scripture*
'too, as their Explication of the Presence of the Bo-
'dy and Blood of Christ in the Holy Sacrament is to
'*Sense*: And, therefore, say they, if notwithstanding
'the seeming Conflict betwixt Faith and Reason in
'the *one* Case, Custom and human Authority is suf-
'ficient to determine and satisfy the Conscience of
'Men: What Reason can we give why the same
'Authority should not be able to decide the no
'greater Conflict between Faith and Sense in the
'*other* Case?' That the Reader may see Protestants
don't speak thus of their own Heads, I shall produce
one Argument made Use of by a Popish Writer in
Behalf of Transubstantiation, or to prove the Possibi-
lity of the *real Presence* in the *Eucharist*, and that a
Body may be in *many Places* at *once*. It is Cardinal
Bellarmine's 5th Argument, taken from the *Mysteries*
of their Faith (as he calls them) in particular that of
the *Trinity*. 'Quintum Argumentum sumitur a
'Mysteriis nostræ Fidei vel difficilioribus vel æque
'difficilibus atque hoc est de quo agimus. Primum
'Mysterium *Trinitatis* est, quod etiam *Lutherani* &
'*Calvinistæ* admittunt: In quo unam Naturam in
'tribus Personis, reipsa verissime distinctis, credimus;
'quod sane *Mirabilius* est quam ut Corpus unum sit
'in pluribus Locis. Nam sicut hic est realis Distinc-
'tio Locorum, ita ibi Personarum: Sicut hic est Uni-
'tas Corporis, ita ibi Naturæ: Sed MIRABILIUS est
'Mysterium Trinitatis, quia Natura in Trinitate iden-
'tificatur realiter & formaliter cum singulis Personis;
'Corpus autem non identificatur ullo Modo cum
'Locis. Si ergo potest una Numero Natura non dis-
'trahi a Seipsâ, licet identificetur cum Personis realiter
'distinctis, cur non *facilius* poterit unum Corpus con-
'jungi extrinsecus cum distinctis Locis, & tamen non
'distrahi a Seipso?' Bellarm. Op. V. III. p. 667.

 Before

Before I dismiss this Head, 'tis fit that some Notice be taken of what Mr. *Anonymous* affirms concerning the *Antiquity* of the Doctrine of the Trinity; he must mean the Doctrine as *explained by himself*, and the *Athanasians*, otherwise he says nothing to the Purpose. Now this Doctrine, he tells us, 'has 'been the Creed of the Church of Christ, *in all Ages*, '*to this Day*, p. 7. Bp. *Stillingfleet* sticks not to 'say, That we are as sure the Primitive Church 'was of the same Faith with us in this Matter, as 'that we *received* the *Scriptures from them*. And 'Bp. *Bull* and Dr. *Waterland*, to name no more, have 'put it beyond all modest Doubt, *ibid.*' But herein, if he does not, he might, and ought to know, that he is *flatly contradicted* by Persons of great Note in the learned World, and as able, diligent, and faithful Enquirers into the Sense of the Ancients, with relation to the Trinity, as those he has mentioned. Besides Dr. *Clarke*'s Scripture Doctrine, which the Reader may consult throughout, I would refer him to *Collection of Queries*, wherein the Author comes to answer the most material Objections against this Book of the Doctor's from *Antiquity*, p. 116, *&* *seq.* And he avers, 'That it is not *clear*, that the [Primitive] 'Antenicene Church professed the [*Athanasian*] No-'tion of *individual Consubstantiality in three Persons*: 'On the contrary, says he, for every *single* Passage 'which the learned Querist can bring from the genu-'ine Remains of such Antiquity, to prove an indivi-'dual Consubstantiality in the three Divine Persons, 'or in *two* of them: I dare promise to return him 'five or ten Times the Number which are directly 'opposite to that Doctrine. Nay, I am fully per-'suaded, the learned Objector cannot produce *one* '*single* Passage in all *Catholick Antenicene Antiquity*, 'which proves an *individual* or *numerical* Consub-'stantiality in the three Divine Persons. *Petavius*, 'and other learned Writers, both Popish and Pro-'testant, have been so fair as to acknowledge, and

'prove at large, that much the greateſt Part of the 'Primitive Fathers were of an Opinion very different 'from the preſent ſcholaſtick Notion.' The ſame Author, in an Appendix, *p.* 146, *& ſeq.* makes it, I think, very apparent from *Titles*, *Attributes*, &c. *appropriated* to God the *Father*, which he inſtances in, and the *different* Stile and Language wherein the moſt primitive Writers ſpeak of *Him*, and the *Son*, and *Spirit*; that the *general Tenor* of Antenicene Antiquity runs againſt an *individual Conſubſtantiality*, and *abſolute Equality* in the Divine Perſons. Agreeable to which, the very learned Dr. *Cudworth* ſays (as cited by Dr. *Clarke*, in Anſwer to *Wells*, p. 47, 48.) 'That no ſuch Thing was ever entertained by the '*Nicene* Fathers, as a Trinity of Perſons numerically 'the ſame [in Subſtance] or having all one and the 'ſame *ſingular* exiſtent Eſſence. The Truth of this 'will appear, firſt, becauſe theſe orthodox *Anti-arian* 'Fathers did all of them zealouſly condemn *Sabellianiſm*; the Doctrine whereof is no other than this, 'that there was but one Hypoſtaſis, or ſingular 'INDIVIDUAL ESSENCE of the Father, Son, and 'Holy Ghoſt. In the next Place, becauſe the Word '*Homooufios* was never uſed by *Greek* Writers, otherwiſe than to ſignify the Agreement of Things NUMERICALLY DIFFERING from one another, *&c.* 'p. 611. Laſtly, that the ancient orthodox Fathers, who 'uſed the Word *Homooufios* againſt *Arius*, intended 'not therein to aſſert the Son to have one, and the 'ſame ſingular, or INDIVIDUAL Eſſence with the 'Father, appeareth plainly, from their diſclaiming 'and diſowning thoſe two Words, ταυτοούσιον and 'μονοούσιον. Again, it is plain, ſays he, that ancient 'orthodox Fathers aſſerted no ſuch Thing, as one 'and the ſame ſingular, or numerical Eſſence of the 'ſeveral Perſons of the Trinity. And this he proves 'by numerous moſt expreſs Quotations.'—Whereas Mr. *A*——*s* refers to Bp. *Bull*, as a Writer who has put it beyond Doubt, that HIS, or the foreſaid Doc-

trine

trine of the Trinity, was the Faith of the Church of Christ *in all Ages:* I hope the Reader, before he takes his Word, will be pleased to look over a small Tract, printed in 1695, and entitled, The Judgment of the Fathers concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, opposed to Dr. *G. Bull*'s Defence of the *Nicene* Faith. And as to Dr. *Waterland*, who is another Writer that *A——s* says has prov'd the same Thing, let the large Reply to his first Defence be consulted, where it treats professedly concerning the Sense of Antiquity, as to the Point in Dispute, *p.* 468.—531. See too Christian Liberty asserted, *p.* 41, *& seq.* 55, 71. And Memoirs of the Doctor's Life and Writings, *p.* 113. Modest Plea continued, *p.* 54, *& seq.* And I will venture to tell Mr. *An——s*, that *his*, and his *Friends*, Doctrine of the Trinity, is so far from being Part of the *Faith once delivered to the Saints*, and of that *Antiquity*, which he pretends, that it is comparatively a *Novel* Doctrine; was brought out of *Popery*, and fram'd by Men [abounding in Wit and Leisure] called School-Men: Of whom Archbishop *Tillotson* says, that they spun Divinity out of their own Brain, as Spiders do Cobwebs, out of their own Bowels. For does not this nameless Writer expresly assert both the Son and Spirit to be of the Father, the Fountain of the Trinity, and to have their *Essence* or Nature from *Him*; the one by *eternal Generation*, the other by eternal *Procession? Vid.* p. 5. 'The 'Son was from Eternity begotten of the Father, by 'a Communication of the *same undivided Essence* and 'Perfections: The Spirit did eternally proceed from 'the Father and the Son, so as that he also enjoys 'the *same individual* Nature and Perfections with 'them. This is our Faith and Opinion.'

And *this* they have received from the *School-Men* amongst the *Papists*, according to what Dr. *Watts* says, Dissertation 5, *p.* 156, *& seq.* 'The 'common Explication of the eternal Generation of 'the Son, and eternal Procession of the Spirit from

'the Father and Son, which was authorized in the 'Latin Churches, was *derived down* to us from the 'Popiſh School-Men; though 'tis now become a Part 'of the eſtabliſh'd, or orthodox Faith, in moſt of 'the *Proteſtant* Nations, becauſe at the Reformation, 'they knew no better Way to explain the Doctrine 'of the ſacred Trinity. They contented themſelves 'to ſay, *it was incomprehenſible*, and thus forbid all 'further Enquiries.' And that the Reader may more fully underſtand what this ſcholaſtick Popiſh Explication of the Manner of the Derivation of the *Son* and *Spirit* from the Father is, I ſhall take the Liberty to preſent him with the Doctor's Account of it, given from the moſt approved Writers, who, he tells us, repreſent it thus: 'That *the Generation of* 'the Son, is the Father's Communication of his own 'ſelf-ſame, individual, ſelf-exiſtent Eſſence to the 'Son, together with the perſonal Property of *being* 'begotten, in and by which Property he differs from 'the Father. And that the *Proceſſion of the Spirit* 'is a Communication of the ſelf-ſame, individual, 'ſelf-exiſtent Eſſence, both from the Father and the 'Son, unto the Spirit, together with the perſonal 'Property of Spiration, or Proceeding, by which 'Property he differs from the Father and the Son. 'How ſtrange ſoever this Language appears to Per-'ſons, who ſeek for Ideas, together with Words, I 'ſeriouſly profeſs this is the juſteſt, trueſt, and, I 'think, the plaineſt Deſcription I can give of this 'Opinion: If it be poſſible to make it plainer, I will 'repeat the ſame in another Form of Words.

'The *ſcholaſtick Scheme* ſuppoſes the *eternal Genera-*'*tion of the Son* to be a Sort of Repetition of the 'ſelf-ſame, numerical, divine Eſſence of the Father, 'together with ſome new perſonal Property, call'd '*Filiation*, which joined to the divine Eſſence, makes 'up the Perſon of the Son: And that this Repeti-'tion, or Reproduction of the ſame divine Eſſence, 'with its new Perſonality, is owing to the Father

'only.

'only. It alſo ſuppoſes the Proceſſion of the Holy 'Spirit to be another Sort of Repetition of the ſelf-'ſame, numerical, divine Eſſence of the Father, to-'gether with ſome new Property, called Proceſſion, 'which, joined to the divine Eſſence, makes up the 'Perſon of the Holy Spirit: And that this Repeti-'tion, or Reproduction of the ſame divine Eſſence, 'with its new Perſonality, is owing both to the Fa-'ther and the Son conjointly; or, as ſome rather 'ſay, 'tis from the Father, as the *original Principle*, 'by the Son as a Medium. There have been Writ-'ers, indeed, who thought it was not proper to ſay 'of the *divine Eſſence* itſelf, that it did *generate*, or 'could be *generated* or derived; and, therefore, they 'ſuppoſed only the *Perſonality* of the Son to be gene-'rated, or derived from the Father, and the *Perſona-'lity* of the *Spirit* to proceed, or be derived from 'the *Father* and the *Son*. But when you enquire 'what theſe *Perſonalities* are, they can only tell you, 'that 'tis Filiation, or *Sonſhip*, and *Spiration*, or *Pro-'ceſſion*. Upon the Whole, therefore, according to 'this Opinion, 'tis *Sonſhip* is generated, and Proceſſion 'proceeds. But the Generality of the ſcholaſtick, or 'orthodox Trinitarians, go into the former Senti-'ments of the *Generation* and *Proceſſion* of the *divine 'Eſſence itſelf*, together with the diſtinct Perſonali-'ties.' Could any Scheme, or Hypotheſis, ſtand the Believers and Eſpouſers of the Doctrine of Tran-ſubſtantiation in greater Stead; or furniſh them with a better Intrenchment, to get into, and defend them-ſelves, when attack'd? Hear the remarkable Words of Biſhop *Taylor*, in his Liberty of prophesying, Sect. 20. Parag. 16. with which I ſhall conclude this Head. 'Indeed, that Tranſubſtantiation is openly and vio-'lently againſt natural Reaſon, is no Argument to 'make them diſbelieve it, who believe the Doctrine 'of the Trinity in all thoſe Niceties of Explication 'which are in the Schools; and which now-a-Days 'paſs for the Doctrine of the *Church*, with as *much*

'Violence

'Violence to the Principles of natural and super-
'natural Philosophy, as can be imagin'd, in the Point
'of Transubstantiation.'

A *second* Ground of Dislike to the forementioned Doctrine of the Trinity, is, my being persuaded, that it has been a grand Obstacle to the Spread of Christian Religion in the World, and will ever be a Prejudice to the Conversion of *Jews*, *Mahometans*, and *Heathens*, p. 7. Now, by the Demand Mr. *A*——*s* makes, *How I* came by this Persuasion? The *Character* he is pleas'd to bestow upon it, and the *Surprize* express'd hereat, the Reader may very possibly be induced to think, that it is somewhat *peculiar* to myself, and a Kind of Reverie, or mere Figment and Conceit of my own Brain[a]. But I am far from being the *first* and *only* Person by whom such Persuasion has been entertained. Mr. *Emlyn*, in his humble Enquiry, *p.* 47, says, 'Tis yet a farther Grief to think what a 'fatal *Stop* is hereby put to the Progress of the Gos-'pel; whose Rejection by *Jews*, *Mahometans*, and '*Pagans*, is undeniably occasion'd by the *common Doc-'trine* of the *Incarnation of God*. One may read, 'in *Le Compte*'s History of *China*, how the Hea-'thens derided the Christians Doctrine of a *mortal* '*God*; and, upon that Account, look'd upon Chris-'tianity as fabulous as their own Religion. And Dr. '*Causabon*, in his Book of Credulity and Incredulity, 'says, He could prove, by many Instances out of 'History, that this *Doctrine has kept more People from* '*embracing the Christian Faith*, than any other Thing 'he knew of.' Again, the Author of Collection of Queries, in his Introduction, *p.* 15. speaks thus, 'I wish all the Defenders of the scholastick Notions '[meaning of the Trinity and Incarnation] would 'seriously consider, whether they *must* not, and *do* 'not, in Defence of their Doctrine, affirm all he '[before] charges them with: And whether [that] be

'either

[a] What could possibly persuade him of this? How came this ridiculous Fancy into his Mind? *p.* 9.

'either *reasonable* or *possible* in itself, or any where 'taught in *Scripture*, or likely to be a Means of *propagating Christian Religion* in the World. We most 'justly argue against the *Papists*, that the Absurdities 'and Contradictions, which they have introduced 'into the true Faith and Worship of God, are an '*irrefragable Bar* against the reasonable Conviction of 'all who are ignorant of, or Enemies to Christianity; and these must necessarily be taken out of the 'Way before we can expect *true Religion* to prevail 'over *Infidelity*. As, therefore, 'tis with the greatest 'Reason and Justice that we condemn *them*, for laying *Offences* before the Church of Christ, which he 'hath denounced a particular Woe against, *Matth.* 'xviii. 7. and which not only hinder those who are '*without*, from entering in, but make many even of 'those who are *within*, to be worse Infidels than the 'very Heathens: So *we ourselves* ought greatly to 'take Care, lest by needlesly imposing any human 'Explications of Doctrines, as necessary Parts of 'Christianity, we become, in any Degree, guilty of 'the like Offence.' And the Author of the Sober Appeal, *p.* 154. 'We have, says he, in the Bible, a Doctrine of the Trinity plain enough. And 'since it hath pleased God to bring it out of that 'Darkness and Obscurity under which it had lain for 'some Ages, as many other great important and 'plain Truths had done; I would hope, that this 'may help to make the Way more easy, for the *propagating* the glorious Gospel of the Redeemer to 'the Heathen Nations. That *great stumbling Block* 'of the *Triune God* (a Notion, as far as appears, never heard of at the first planting of the Gospel) being removed, the Time may be coming, when 'Knowledge shall be increased, even the Knowledge 'of the Truth, whereby Men shall be saved; the 'Knowledge of the one God, and one Mediator, between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.' And a late anonymous Writer on the Doctrine of the Tri-

nity assures us, 'That there is a Number of Men, 'who are prejudiced against, and do reject this 'weighty Article (and many reject Christianity, in 'general, on its Account) because they are per-'suaded, it is impossible, or contradictory, and in-'consistent with Reason. Many Men labour under 'so strong a Prepossession, that this Mystery is im-'possible, that till they be cured of this Prejudice, 'by a sensible Demonstration of the Possibility of 'that abstruse Doctrine, in some Sense manifestly 'consistent with Reason, as well as Scripture, no 'other Arguments can have any Effect with them, 'or be duly weighed by them.'—Well; but with Respect to the *Jews* particularly, the *said Doctrine*, Mr. *A——s* tells us, can be no Prejudice to *their* Conversion, seeing, 'The Old Testament is *full* of it.' And so he produces a great Number of Texts thrown together as they occurred to his Mind, which, in his Opinion, super-abundantly convince, 'That if the '*Jews*, indeed, believe the Scriptures of the Old 'Testament, the Doctrine that there *are three* Per-'sons in the *Godhead*, *&c.* cannot prejudice them 'against Christianity.' But in *neither* of these Texts, no, nor *all* of them together, is *that Doctrine* of *his* taught; as Expositions given of the most *noted*, and on which the principal Stress is laid, by Writers named in the Margin[a], are enough, I think, to manifest. And Bp. *Kidder* assures us, Vol. III. *p.* 160. 'That 'the *Jews* do, upon all Occasions, dispute against 'the said Doctrine, and that with *great Vehemence:* 'They

[a] *Gen.* i. 26. Sober Appeal, *p.* 14. *Chubb*, p. 31. *Gen.* xvii. 18. *per totum.* Sober Appeal, *p.* 78, 87. 19, 24. Idem 111. *p.* 22, 11, *&* *seq.* Idem 95. *Isa.* ix, 6. Sober Appeal, *p.* 91, 93. Reply to *Waterland*'s first Defence, *p.* 227. *Chubb*, p. 36. *Jer.* xxiii. 5, 6. Sober Appeal, *p.* 72. *Chubb*, p. 36. *Micah* v. 2. Truth and Importance, *p.* 65. Collection of Queries, *p.* 83. *Gen.* i. 2. Truth and Importance, *p.* 65. 2 *Sam.* xxiii. 2, 3. Dr. *Watts*'s Dissertations, *p.* 5, 131. *Isa.* lxiii. 10. Idem. Ibid. As to the Texts wherein the Messiah is called Jehovah, see above, *p.* 16, 17, *&c.*

'They endeavour to expose it, and to render it ridiculous and incredible. In *Fact*, it is *true*, that this Doctrine is a *Bar*, hindering them from embracing Christianity. This, they pretend, as a *main* Obstacle, and, I will admit, that in *Fact so it is*. They pretend, that it is *absurd*, and *against Reason*; a Contradiction; that it infers *Tritheism*, and a Plurality of Gods, and is not *agreeable to the Law of* Moses, *and the Old Testament*.' So in the Discourse concerning the Necessity of believing the Doctrine of the Trinity, we are told, 'That the *Jewish* Doctors argue warmly against this Principle of Christianity: They are the most determinate Adversaries of this Article of our Holy Faith: The Authors from whom, at first or second hand, the modern Deists have borrowed their Weapons. The *Jews* argue thus: It implies a Contradiction to say, that in the Godhead there are three separate Things, of which each do consist, and are actually distinct, or *Persons* (as they, *i. e.* the Christians speak) which are one. This Opinion, say they, does contradict common Principles of Reason. Thus talks *R. Jos. Albo* contra Christ. p. 12. *Vid.* Disc. p. 68.' The Words of *Chrysostom* are here likewise well worthy the Reader's Consideration, as I find them cited and translated in the Modest Plea, *p.* 241. 'The Apostles, though they speak much of Christ, in the Book of the *Acts*, yet say very little about his *Divinity*.—For how could it be but the *Jews*, who heard it read and inculcated to them every Day in the Law, *The Lord thy God, even the Lord, is one*, and there is none other but He:—How could it be, if they had been told, that Christ was himself God, and *equal* to his *Father*, but they must, of all others, [i. e. *more than even the* Gentiles] have flown off from the Apostles, and broken away from them.'

Again, as to the *Mahometans*, Mr. *A——s* requires to be inform'd, '*How his* Doctrine of the Trinity can be a Hindrance or Prejudice to *their* Conver-

 'sion?'

'sion?' *p.* 11. I tell him then, that *naturally*, and of *Necessity*, it is, and will be, so: Not only because the said Doctrine is *absurd* in itself (as has been clearly prov'd, I think, above) but because the *Koran* of these People, a Book of no less Authority with them, than the Bible is with us Christians, teaches them thus to esteem it: Yea, 'tis moreover herein declared to be *impious and wicked*; a Doctrine quite contrary to that, for restoring which *Mahomet* gave out he was chiefly sent, namely, the *Unity of God*: And the Belief of the said Doctrine is accordingly forbidden by the *Koran*, in a very express Manner, and under very severe Penalties. 'Say not there are *three* Gods, 'forbear this, it will be better for you: God is but 'one God.' See *Sale*'s *Koran*, p. 81. and on this Passage is the following Note. 'Three Gods, name-'ly, God, Jesus, and *Mary*.' For the Eastern Writers mention a Sect of Christians, which held the Trinity to be composed of those three; but it is allowed, that this Heresy has been long since extinct. The Passage, however, is *equally* levelled against the *Trinity*, according to the Doctrine of the *orthodox Christians*, who believe the divine Nature to consist of three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost' [or that these three subsist therein.] Again, 'They are surely Infidels, who say, verily God is 'Christ, the Son of *Mary*: Since Christ said, serve 'God, my Lord, and your Lord: Whosoever shall 'give [an Associate or] a Companion to God[a], God 'shall exclude him from Paradise, and his Habitation 'shall be Hell-Fire, and the Ungodly shall have none 'to help them. They are certainly Infidels, who say 'God is the third of three: For there is no God be-'sides one God; and if they refrain not from what 'they say, a painful Torment shall surely be inflicted 'on such of them as are Unbelievers,' *p.* 92. The Chapter of the *Unity* in the *Koran*, though short, is held

[a] Deus est Ens cui nullus æqualis aut par, Reland. de Fide Mohammedica in Deum, p. 9.

held in mighty Veneration by the *Mahometans*, so that they even reckon it, we are told, worth a third Part of the whole Book, *p.* 507. And *Sale*, in his Preliminary Discourse, says, 'That making Distinctions 'in the Deity, is a Thing these People do [especially, 'or] so much abhor in Christians,' *p.* 160.

A *third* Ground of Dislike to Mr. *Anonymous*'s, and the *Athanasian* Doctrine of the Trinity mentioned in my Letter, is, its having been an Occasion of endless *Disputes*, and infinite *Uncharitableness* amongst the Professors of Christianity, *p.* 7. Now, as to the *Disputes* occasioned by this Doctrine, the Volumes of them extant in the World do sufficiently testify *what*, and how *many* they have been. And I can readily agree, that they were *Innovators*, ay, and *new-fangled* ones too, *p.* 13. (to borrow Mr. *Anonymous*'s Expressions) through whose Fault these Disputes did chiefly happen, and upon whom the Blame of them ought to be laid: *Such*, for Example, as the *Authors* of the said Doctrine, together with its *Patronizers* and *Defenders:* Who not content with the *Simplicity* of Faith delivered down from the Apostles, and what the Scripture plainly declares as to the *Trinity*, and the *like revealed Points*, ventured to *enlarge* their *Creeds beyond the Bounds of Scripture*, and to express their Faith about them, not in the Words taught here by the *Holy Ghost*, but in Terms of *Philosophy* and *human Invention:* Nay, and to set *these* upon a *Level* with (if not place them above) *those inspired divine* Words; I mean by *imposing* them as *Tests* of *Orthodoxy*, and adding *Anathema's* upon all by whom they should be rejected or disapproved, and not made use of. *Thus* a Foundation for Controversies and Quarrels came to be laid; and *hereupon* it was that such Things quickly took Place throughout the Christian World[a]. Accordingly

[a] 'This presumptuous Imposing of the Senses of Men upon the Words of God; the special Senses of Men upon the general Words of God, and laying them upon Mens Consciences toge-'ther,

cordingly the learned *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Cæsarea*, represents them as owing their Original to certain *unscriptural* Words that had been introduced. 'Ex *his* 'vocibus, (ἀγραφοις φωναῖς) omnis fere Dissensio ac 'perturbatio Ecclesiarum exorta est.' From *these* Words has arisen almost all the Confusion and Distractions that have happened to the Churches. Vid. Socrat. Eccles. Hist. Lib. I. Cap. 8. p. 26. If we take only the Word ὁμοούσιος (translated in *English* by *consubstantial*) after it had received a Confirmation and Sanction from the *Nicene* Synod; how great Differences and Feuds did it create? 'The Quarrel first 'began from the Use of ἀγεννητόγενης, and such like 'Terms, by Pope *Alexander*, was (Mr. *Chandler* tells 'us, in his valuable History of Persecution) continu-'ed, and rendered irreconcilable, by imposing the 'ὁμοούσιος; or, as *Socrates* speaks, the Church was 'torn in Pieces by a Civil War, for the Sake of *Atha-'nasius* and the Word consubstantial.' Hist. *p.* 75. 'They who were Lovers of Strife and Contention, 'more than Lovers of Truth and Charity, imme-'diately fell a quarrelling about this Word, as the 'Author

'ther, under the equal Penalty of Death and Damnation; this 'vain Conceit, *that we can speak of the Things of God better than 'in the Words of God:* This deifying our own Interpretations, and 'tyrannous inforcing them upon others: This restraining of the 'Word of God from that Latitude and Generality, and the Un-'derstandings of Men from that Liberty wherein Christ and the 'Apostles left them, is, and hath been, the only *Fountain* of all 'the *Schisms in the Church*; and that which makes them continue 'the common Incendiary of *Christendom*; and that which tears 'into Pieces not the Coat, but the Bowels and Members of Jesus 'Christ, *Ridente Turcâ, nec dolente Judæo.* Take away these 'Walls of Separation, and all will be quickly one: Take away 'persecuting, burning, cursing, damning of Men, for not sub-'scribing to the Words of Men as the Words of God:—Take 'away Tyranny, and restore Christians to their just and full Li-'berty of captivating their Understandings to *Scripture only:* And 'as Rivers, when they have free Passage, run all to the Ocean; 'so it may well be hoped, by God's Blessing, that universal Li-'berty, thus moderated, may quickly reduce *Christendom* to 'Truth and Unity.' *Chillingworth*, Chap. 4. Sect. 16.

'Author of Christian Liberty asserted informs us, *p.* '30. And a greater Stress was laid upon it than up'on all the Articles of the Christian Faith: One Par'ty understanding it in the *Sabellian* Sense, of being '*one individual Substance*, and so that the *Father and* '*Son* were the same *Being*, *Person*, *Agent*, or *God:* 'The other Party, on the direct contrary, under'standing it to mean the *same specifick Substance*, in 'the Sense of *Tritheism*, or *Ditheism*, which made the '*Father* and *Son* two distinct consubstantial *Beings*, '*Agents*, *Persons*, or *Gods:* Both equally destroying 'the true *Divinity* of Christ, the Son of God; the 'one by *confounding* his *Person* with the *Father*; the 'other by *dividing* the Substance of the one God into '*two Persons*.'

'In the Disputes among the Orthodox, the 'Heat and Rage used on both Sides caused *infi*'*nite Confusions* in the Church: For even those who 'agreed in the Doctrine of the Trinity, yet debated 'with one another the *Term*, *one Substance*, till they 'fell into strange Contention.'—See the Manner of these Things excellently well described by the Ecclesiastical Historian. The Clause of *one Substance* 'troubled exceedingly their Minds, and whilst that 'they rifled and searched out the Sense and Under'standing thereof even unto the Quick; they raised 'civil Discord among themselves, so that their Con'clusions seemed nothing else but Combats in the 'Night, and Darkness, or blindfold Babbling, *&c.* 'Vindication of the Orthodox Faith of the Church of '*England*, p.46, 47.'—*Turretin* too says, Vol. I. *p.*271. 'Quantæ turbæ propter hanc Vocem natæ sint nemo 'ignorat, nisi qui in Historiâ Ecclesiastica plane est 'hospes. And *Bellarmin* owns, Vol. I. p. 266. 'Tota illa tragœdia, quæ Ecclesiam tot annis miserè 'vastavit, propter *hanc unam* Vocem concitata est.' So that I wonder not to hear what the Cardinal (if I remember right) somewhere reports of *Luther*, viz. that he hated this Word at his very Heart. 'Hanc 'Vocem anima mea odit.'

As

As to the *Uncharitableness* occasioned by the fore-mention'd Doctrine, and how *great* this has been, the Reader may be able *partly* to judge from what has been already said. But he will be more *fully* convinced of the same, if he attends to the Usage of bringing in that Doctrine into Lists of *fundamental Articles of* Divinity; nay, giving it here a *chief* Place: Making the *Knowledge* and *Belief* of it *necessary*, in order to Mens *enjoying Christian Communion now, and obtaining eternal Salvation at last:* Some Specimens of which, therefore, I intend to add. 'An Trinitatis 'Mysterium sit articulus fundamentalis Fidei? Affir-'matur.' Turret. Vol. I. p. 277. 'Et ad statum 'Quæstionis observa, non agi tantum de *Negatione* 'illius Articuli, sed de *simplici Ignoratione*; quædam 'enim in Verbo revelata ejusmodi sunt ut citra Salutis 'dispendium possint ignorari, licet sine ejusdem peri-'culo, non possint negari. Sed Trinitatis non so-'lum Negatio, sed & simplex Ignoratio est damna-'bilis.' And after some Distinctions about Degrees of Knowledge, *&c.* he says, 'Quæstio ergo eo re-'dit, an Mysterium Trinitatis sit articulus fundamen-'talis qui fidelibus omnibus creditu sit necessarius, ut 'sine Salutis dispendio non modo negari, sed nec ig-'norari possit; quod adversarii negant, nos asserimus.' 'Mysterium Dei Triunici est fundamentum funda-'mentorum, ita ut sublatâ Trinitate necesse sit omnia 'protinus Evangelica funditus corruere. *Cheynel*'s Dedication to his Book of the divine Trinunity. 'The 'grand Mystery of three divine and co-essential Sub-'sistents in the single Godhead, is a fundamental 'Point, *i. e.* a Point without the plain and express 'Knowledge whereof we can neither savingly be-'lieve in Christ, nor rightly worship God in Christ 'to the obtaining of eternal Life.' *Idem*, p. 250. 'There is nothing in which a Christian can err with '*greater Danger*, than this great and holy Mystery 'of three Persons in one divine Essence. The Con-'ceit either of three *Substances*, or but *one Subsis-*

 '*tence*,

'*tence*, is erroneous and damnable.' A Writer about the Middle of the laſt Century, quoted in the Sober Appeal, *p.* 12. 'The Doctrine of three real Perſons 'in one eternal Godhead, is a fundamental Doctrine 'of Chriſtianity. Of this I have largely treated elſe-'where: Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity aſſerted. [a] *Waterland* of Fundamentals, *p.* 22. '*Who-'ſoever* will be ſaved, *before all Things*, it is neceſſary 'that he hold the Catholick Faith, which Faith 'except *every one* do keep pure and undefiled, he 'ſhall periſh everlaſtingly. And the Catholick Faith 'is *this*; that we do worſhip one God in Trinity, and 'Trinity in Unity, *&c.* [b]' Where the Words [and 'the Catholick Faith] do ſo plainly determine the 'Signification to the Explication that comes after, 'that the Word Catholick Faith, in the firſt Verſe, 'can be no other than the ſame Word, as it is de-'fined in the third and following Verſes. *Burnet* on 'the Articles, *p.* 106.' 'The Catholick Faith is by 'the 3d and 4th Verſes explained to be this, that 'we worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity, *&c.* 'This, therefore, is declared neceſſary to be believed '(the Catholick Faith as here expreſs'd) in order to 'Salvation. *Wheatly* on Common-Prayer, *p.* 154.' 'Afterwards, therefore, 'tis ſaid, in the Creed, He 'that will be ſaved, *muſt thus think of the Trinity*, 'ver. 27.' So Mr. *Anonymous* calls the Doctrine of the Trinity, *i. e. his*, or the *Athanaſian* Doctrine, the *great fundamental* in our Religion, aſſerts it be of the *laſt Importance*, and, that without a Belief of it, Hope of Salvation is vain. 'Our Salvation is founded here-'upon.—I do, and muſt believe it, if *I expect Salva-'tion*; even that Salvation which the Father hath pro-'miſed,

[a] The Deſign and Purport of which Book throughout (as the Author of Chriſtian Liberty tells us) is, 'To ſhew, that they who 'do not profeſs, or who oppoſe, his Notion of the Trinity, ought 'to undergo the higheſt Church Cenſures; to be denied Chriſ-'tian Communion; and to be farther puniſhed, as the Law ſhall 'think fit.'

[b] Preface to *Athanaſian* Creed.

'mised, the Son purchased, and the Spirit applies.' *Vid.* p. 22, 23. Let the Reader also consult a Discourse concerning the Necessity of believing the Doctrine of the Trinity, printed by *E. Matthews*, 1719. Chap. 2. He may see too, if he pleases, Dr. *Mangey*'s Sermon, entitled, Plain Notions of our Lord's Divinity, *p.* 33, 34. And a Vindication of the Orthodox Faith and Doctrine of the Church of *England*, p. 2, 25, 26, 50, 54, 55, 56.

I come now to the *last* Ground of Dislike to the *Athanasian* Doctrine of the Trinity mentioned in my Letter, namely, that this Doctrine has produced abundance of *ignorant*, unmeaning, uncommanded Worship: Not only *direct Invocations* of the TRINITY (*ex. gr.*) and Prayers to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *as three in one*, and *one in three:* But *Doxologies* likewise addressed to *each* of these three Persons, *equalizing* them in *Power* and *Glory*, Vid. p. 7. And that *both* these Forms or Kinds of Worship *abound* in *Christendom*, more *especially the Church of* Rome, is *notoriously true:* Nor do I think I have given them any *worse* Epithets, and Characters, than they really deserve. For with respect to *invoking* the whole sacred Trinity *together*, or calling upon, and presenting Prayers to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as the *Triune God:* Is that to be done with Meaning and Understanding? Does a Man, when he thus prays, know *who* and *what* he worships? Can he have any clear Conceptions of the Object of his Addresses; or consistent *Ideas* affixed in his Mind to the Words he may utter with his Lips? As suppose, for Instance, in the following Forms. 'O Holy *Trinity*, *one God*, have Mercy upon 'us. May the Blessing of *God the Trinity*, *Father*, *Son*, 'and *Spirit*, one *co-eternal*, *co-essential Three*, descend 'upon us, and dwell in our Hearts. O holy consub-'stantial and undivided *Trinity*, be propitious to us; 'and grant us Faith in *thee*, *as such*, firm, and stedfast: 'That rejecting all the fallacious Suggestions of short 'Reason, we may continue humbly to adore *thee*, *three*

'every

'*every Way co-equal* Persons in the same *indivisible* '*Deity*, till we come hereafter to *thy* blissful Presence, 'and see the Mystery revealed in thy own glorious 'Face[a].' Let Mr. *Anonymous* explain these Things, and free them from the Imputation of *Nonsense* and *Absurdity*, if he can. Or let him even reduce the Terms, *three* distinct Agents [or *Persons*] and *one God*, into an intelligible and consistent Proposition. The Author of the Sober Appeal, *p.* 11. scruples not to affirm, 'That these Expressions, so far as we are al- 'lowed to come at their Meaning, do involve, or car- 'ry in them a real Contradiction. And I never yet '(says he) met with any Sense of them, which did 'not evidently appear inconsistent either with the 'Notion that all Mankind have ever had of three 'distinct Persons on the one Hand, or else with the 'Notion they have always had of one God on 'the other.' *Vid.* also *p.* 53, 54. And if a Person's Worship may justly be charged with want of Knowledge and Meaning, when he addresses to God the Trinity, or to God, as three in one, and one in three, and Sim, by *Way of Invocation*; 'twill be readily granted, that it is no less liable to the *same Charge*, when he thus addresses him in a Way of *Doxology*. And *both* Ways are deservedly reckoned and stiled *unscriptural*, seeing not so much as one *Rule* or *Example* for either is to be met with throughout the New Testament. Nor need it seem strange, that no such Thing here occurs, because (as my Letter adds) the New Testament represents God, *even the Father*, as the most proper, constant Object of our Addresses in Worship, *p.* 7. For the Truth of which Assertion, I refer the Reader to the Passages and Texts collected

 by

[a] The first of these is a common Form of Address used in Popish Countries, which *Calvin* expresses a particular Dislike of. 'Precatio (inquit) vulgo trita est, Sancta Trinitas unus Deus mise- 'rere nostri, mihi non placet, ac omnino Barbariem sapit.' Ep. ad Polon. 591. Ed. Amst. The other two I have extracted from a Popish Book of Devotions, written in the ancient Way of Offices, printed at *Roan*, 1672.

by Dr. *Clarke*, in his Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, Chap. 1. Sect. 4. p. 64, *& seq.* wherein the Worship to be paid to God the Father, whether by Adoration and Prayer, or Thanksgiving and Praise, is described and set forth. And though there be a Worship belonging to the Son, as we are plainly taught in the New Testament; yet it *differs* from what we are required to pay the *Father*, not being *supreme* and *ultimate*, as that is, but *subordinate* and *mediate*. I wish for nothing more than to have this *important* Matter determined by *every* Command and Instance of addressing Worship to him, that is to be produced. The Precepts and Examples hereof on which the greatest Stress is laid, are, I think, these *that follow*; whose Meaning ought, therefore, to be carefully enquired into. *John* v. 23. That all Men should honour the Son, *even* as they honour the Father. But is there not a plain Distinction, or Limitation hereupon, suggested to us in the very Words that immediately go before, and in those that immediately come after, as Dr. *Clarke* observes, Answer to the Author of some Considerations, *p.* 260. 'Here is an ex-
'press Distinction, or Limitation added, from the
'*Reason* and *End* of the Honour paid to the Son.
'The *Reason* or *Ground* of it is, that the Father hath
'committed all Judgment to the Son; and the *End*
'of it is to the Honour of the Father which sent
'him. Our Saviour's own Words are; *The Father*
'*judgeth no Man, but hath committed* all *Judgment to*
'*the Son: That all Men should honour the Son, even*
'*as they honour the Father: He that honoureth not the*
'*Son, honoureth not the Father, which sent him.* Be-
'sides, the Word [καθὼς, *even as*] in St. *John*'s Stile,
'never signifies an exact Equality, but only a gene-
'ral Similitude. Thus, *John* xvii. 11. That they all
'may be one, *as* [καθὼς] we are. *Ver.* 14. They
'are not of the World, even as [καθὼς] I am not
'of the World. *Ver.* 21. That they all may be
'one, as [καθὼς] thou, Father, art in me, and I in
'thee.

'thee. *Ver.* 23. Thou haſt loved them, as [καθὼς] 'thou haſt loved me.' *Vid.* on this Text likewiſe Collection Queries, *p.* 95, 96, 97.

Again, *Phil.* ii. 10, 11. God hath highly exalted him, and given [freely beſtowed on, ἐχαρίσατο] him a Name which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow [every Thing ſhould be ſubject to his Dominion[a]] of Things in Heaven, and Things in Earth, and Things under the Earth: And that [acccordingly in Acknowledgment of that Dominion] every Tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to *the Glory of* GOD THE FATHER. Can any Worſhip elſe be here deſigned to be ſignified, than that which is of an inferior, mediate Kind, a Worſhip expreſly referr'd to *another*. and declared to tend to his Glory, as the ultimate End, *viz.* the Glory of GOD THE FATHER[b]? But Mr. *A*——*s* tells his Reader the Words, ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ Πατρός, ſhould be more literally tranſlated, as it is in many Verſions, that the Lord Jeſus Chriſt is *in* the Glory of God the Father, *i. e.* hath the ſame Glory that He hath. This he borrows, I ſuppoſe, from Dr. *Waterland*'s Second Defence, *p.* 390. And the Reader will find a fit Anſwer to it return'd, in Obſervations on that Defence, *p.* 20. "I cannot but wonder, whence it comes to paſs, that ſome Men of great Abilities, and great Learning, can never be made to underſtand *Grammar*. For becauſe where two different Phraſes happen (in any particular Caſe) to amount to the ſame Thing in Senſe, they may, *in that Caſe* (not indeed be put the one for the other, but) either of them be uſed indifferently, and with equal Propriety; therefore, in other Caſes, where they will not amount to the ſame Thing in Senſe, and where they *cannot* be uſed with equal Propriety, Men will ſtill contend, that one of them may be put for the other: Than which nothing can be more abſurd;

[a] Dr. *Clarke*'s Anſwer, *ibid.* p. 240.
[b] *Vid.* Sober Appeal, *p.* 126.

as must needs be evident to every one who will be pleased to make Trial of it in his own Mother Tongue. But to instance in the Word here referred to. If I mean to affirm, that a Man is *in the* Field, I can, with equal Propriety of Speech, say, either that he is ἐν ἀγρῷ, or εἰς ἀγρὸν; because the Sense, in this Case, happens to be the same, whether I say, that he is in the Field, or that he is gone, or carried into the Field. But, if I intend to express, that Grass grows in the Field, I cannot say εἰς ἀγρὸν, but only ἐν ἀγρῷ. When Dr. *W——d* apprehends the Reason of this, he will know why he *could not* (though he fancies he *might*) have insisted on the rendering of the Text here mentioned." Again, *Rev.* v. 11, 12. The Angels, and a numberless Number besides, join in saying, worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Power, *&c.* Yea, and every Creature which is in Heaven, and on Earth, and under the Earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto him that sitteth on the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. 'Here then, says Mr. '*Anonymous* (p. 18.) we find the whole Creation 'ascribing the very *same Worship* with the same 'Breath, and in the same Words to the Father and 'to the Lamb. Here then is *equal* Worship paid to '*both*, and that by the whole World. What can 'be said to this?' Why, 'tis easy to reply, that tho' the Words expressing the Worship paid, are the same; *Blessing*, *Honour*, *Glory*, to the *Lamb*, and to him *that sits upon the Throne:* Yet the Lamb, standing among the Elders, in the Midst, or before the Midst, of the Throne, and God represented as sitting on the Throne of Majesty, make a sensible Difference of the two Objects, enough to distinguish the Nature of the Worship paid to each [a]. Especially considering withal what immediately precedes in Verses 9, 10. where the new Song of Praise mention'd, as address'd to

[a] *Vid.* Emlyn, *p.* 88.

to the *Lamb*, is expresly said to be upon *Account of* his *dying*, that he might *redeem us* with *his Blood*, &c. and *making us Kings and Priests*: Both which too are here affirm'd to be done TO GOD, *i. e.* to Him that sitteth upon the Throne, *viz.* to the Father; Κύριος Θεὸς ὁ Παντοκράτωρ, The Lord God Supreme Ruler over all [a]. They sung a new Song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the Book, *&c.* For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us *to God* by thy Blood out of every Kindred and Tongue, and People, and Nation, and hast made us unto *our* GOD Kings and Priests.

As to Christians being characteriz'd by this, that they *call upon the Name of Jesus Christ*, which Mr. *A——s* farther urges to shew, that *supreme* Worship is due to him, as well as to the Father ('For who 'will dare to stile this inferior Worship? *p.* 17.') The Reader must note, that to call on the Name of Christ, is a Phrase used in great Variety of Senses [b] in the New Testament: But allowing it to signify directly *invoking*, or praying to him in his own Person, that may possibly amount to no more, as Mr. *Emlyn* has observed, than applying to him as the one Mediator between God and Men, with Desire to have the Help and Benefit of his Intercession. ' 'Tis apparent, says 'the same Writer, that the current Method of the 'New Testament is to pray to God by Jesus Christ; 'or in his Name, as our Intercessor. And this is 'the constant Strain of the truly Primitive Writers, 'as appears in *Clemens Romanus*, in *Polycarp*'s Prayer, 'in *Origen*'s Prayer, *&c.* They offered their Prayers to Jesus Christ, as their High Priest, to present 'them to God. So that though it seems, in some 'sort, to be one Act of Worship, yet there is a Subordination in the *two Objects*, that are so conjoined, 'whether I pray expresly to God, or Jesus Christ.

' For

[a] *Vid.* Dr. *Clarke*'s Answer to the Author of Some Considerations, *p.* 264.

[b] Dr. *Clarke*'s Scripture Doctrine, *p.* 139.

'For if I pray to God, 'tis that he will accept and 'help [or bless] me, through Jesus Christ: And if I 'pray to Jesus Christ, 'tis that he will help me by 'interceding with the Father. 'Tis He [God the Father] only, to whom I principally and ultimately 'pay my Worship, though I honour the *Son* as my 'great Advocate and Priest, to present it with Advantage. This is the plain, easy Sense of the Gospel. I no otherwise call on him, than as I believe 'on him, and come to him, which is only as the '*Way to the* Father, not as to the *Supreme* Himself, 'which is never required.' *Vid. Emlyn*'s Tracts, *p.* 55, 56, 57, 58. I leave it then to the Reader to judge, from the Commands and Examples for worshipping Christ that have been produc'd, and which are confessedly, I think, the *Principal*, whether it be as Mr. *A*——*s* boldly asserts, a *clear* and *undeniable* Case, that the SAME Glory, or that *equal* Glory is ascribed to *him* with the *Father*, p. 18. But Mr. *A*——*s* farther affirms, 'That the whole Church, in the New 'Testament, worship Jesus Christ immediately and 'ultimately,' and brings, as an Instance to prove it, *Acts* i. 24, 25, *&c.* The Words there are, "And they, *viz.* the Apostles and Disciples, prayed and said, Thou Lord, which knowest the Hearts of all Men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take Part of this Ministry and Apostleship, from which *Judas*, by Transgression, fell, that he might go to his own Place. And they gave forth the Lots, *&c.*" But no express Mention is at all here made of *Jesus Christ*; and though *Woltzogenius* thinks the Prayer directed to *him*, yet he does not, in my Apprehension, fully support this Opinion; and I know of nothing to hinder, but that we may well suppose the Prayer to be address'd to God the *Father:* So that this Instance of Worship answers not the Purpose for which it is alledged.

With Respect to the *grand* Objections made by Mr. *A*——*s* against *all* subordinate, mediatorial Worship from

from the first Commandment, and *Matth.* iv. 10. they are thoroughly considered, and effectually solved by the Author of the Reply to Dr. *Waterland*'s Defence, under the Questions relating to divine Adoration and Worship, *p.* 354, *& seq.* Likewise by the Author of the Sober Appeal, *p.* 121, *& seq.* And more lately still, by the Author of a Charitable Disquisition concerning the Importance of the Trinity, *p.* 4, *& seq.* The last of which Authors will lead him to the right Sense of a Text whereon he lays a vast, but undue Stress; *Doing Service to them, who by Nature are not God*, Gal. iv. 8.

As to other Objections of his against mediate and inferior Worship, which are not made from the *Scripture*, I shall think I am excusable in letting them go unanswered.

My Letter adds, that as for putting up Prayers directly and expressly to the Person of the *Holy Spirit*, though there may seem to be a Foundation for it in the Oeconomy of the Gospel; yet not so much as one *clear Command* or *Example* of this can be produced, *p.* 7. Now Mr. *Anonymous* would fain make an Advantage of the Words, there may seem to be a Foundation for this, *&c.* And accordingly he asks, *p.* 19. 'Would there have been *any*, even a seeming 'Foundation for it, without some Reality in the Na-'ture of Things?' But one might easily turn upon him, and ask again, if there be a Foundation for *such* Practice, *real* and solid, as he supposes, en't it strauge, that we should have it *no where* mentioned nor prescribed? How comes it to pass, that the Scripture is wholly silent upon this Affair; that not one Precept or Example for it is here to be found? Which, notwithstanding the several Texts and Passages he has quoted, I must persist in affirming to be the Truth of the Case. Those two relating to *Baptism* and *Blessing*, have been considered before: As also that in *Isa.* vi. compared with *Acts* xxviii. 25. To which he adds, *Acts* iv. 24, 25. 1 *Cor.* iii. 16. compared

pared with Chap. vi. 19. 1 *Cor.* xii. 7—11. *Rev.* i. 4. 2 *Theſſ.* iii. 5. And each of theſe, it ſhall now be my Buſineſs particularly to examine.

The firſt is *Acts* iv. 24, 25. 'When they hear'd 'that, they lift up their Voice to God with one Ac- 'cord, and ſaid, Lord, thou art God, which haſt 'made Heaven and the Earth, and the Sea, and all 'that in them is. Who by the Mouth of thy Ser- 'vant *David* haſt ſaid, Why did the Heathen rage, 'and the People imagine a vain Thing, *&c.*' Where, Mr. *A*——*s* will have it, 'That the Perſon, who by 'the Mouth of his Servant *David* had ſaid, *&c.* and 'is called *God*, and that with an Article too, yea, 'and Δεσπότης, a Word ſignifying ſupreme Domini- 'on, is the *Holy Ghoſt*. Several Things (he tells 'us) in the Context confirm it; and in particular 'when they pray, *ver.* 29. that he would grant un- 'to them, that with all Boldneſs they might ſpeak 'his Word, and might be enabled to do Miracles: 'Becauſe it is his peculiar Work to encourage the 'faithful Miniſters of the Word under Affliction and 'Perſecution; it was by *him* our Lord himſelf, as 'Mediator, wrought his Miracles, *Matth.* xii. 28. 'and from *him* the Diſciples were to receive Power to 'work Signs and Wonders, and, indeed, all neceſſary 'Furniture for their Work, *Luke* xxiv. 49. compar'd 'with *Acts* i. 8. *p.* 20.' This he has the Aſſurance to call an INFALLIBLE *Rule of interpreting*; when yet a bare Peruſal of the *whole* Prayer is enough, I apprehend, to convince every Body how egregiouſly he is miſtaken. Lord, thou art God, who haſt made Heaven, *&c.* Who by the Mouth of thy Servant *David* ſaidſt, Why did, *&c.* The Kings of the Earth ſtood up, and the Rulers were gathered together againſt the Lord, and againſt his Chriſt. For of a Truth againſt *thy Holy Child Jeſus*, whom *Thou* haſt *anointed*, both *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, with the *Gentiles*, and People of *Iſrael*, were gathered together, for to do whatſoever *thy* Hand and *thy* Counſel

 determined

determined before to be done. And now, *Lord*, behold their Threatnings, and grant unto *thy* Servants, that with all Boldness they may speak thy Word, by stretching forth *thy* Hand to heal; and that Signs and Wonders may be done by the Name of *thy Holy Child Jesus*. Gr. παιδὸς σοῦ, rendered, *Matth.* xii. 18. thy Servant, and so in this Prayer, *ver.* 25.

The next Passages are, 1 *Cor.* iii. 16. and Chap. vi. 19. compar'd. 'Know ye not, that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? Again, Know ye not, that ye are the Temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God? Whence it is evident, says Mr. *Anonymous*, that he is God, and the peculiar Object of all religious Worship. A Temple is built only for *God*, and is his Habitation; but a God who is not to be worshipped is not God; and for Believers to forget to worship him, whose Temples they are, must needs be wickedly foolish and ungrateful.' But we are to understand the Term *God*, in the first of these Passages, as signifying the *Father*; not only because in many Hundreds of other Places, where it occurs, put absolutely, it has no other Signification; but even here, in the preceding Context, *ver.* 9. We are Labourers together of God: Ye are God's Husbandry, ye are God's *Building*, meaning, *i. e.* God the Father's: Who is contradistinguished, the Reader will observe, from the Foundation of the Building spoken of presently after, *ver.* 11. *viz.* Jesus Christ. And is not the obvious Sense of the Apostle then, that they were the Temple of God, even the *Father*, for as much as he, *by the Holy Ghost*, who was *his Spirit*, and *Gift*, influenced and inhabited them? The latter Clause, in my Opinion, serves to explain the former, and lets us know why, or upon what Account, they might be properly stiled the Temple of God. Ye are his Temple, *q. d. because*, or seeing that *his* Spirit dwelleth in you. So in the other Passage, 1 *Cor.* vi. 19. Your Body is the Temple of the

Holy Ghost, which is in you, *which ye have* of GOD, *i. e.* Your Bodies, by being Temples of the Holy Ghost, are the Temples of God, for he resides in you by his Holy Spirit. Thus too, 2 *Cor.* vi. 16. What Concord hath Christ with *Belial*, or what Agreement hath the *Temple* of *God* with Idols? For ye are the Temple of the living God; an holy Temple in, and by, the Lord, built for an Habitation of God, thro' the Spirit; as 'tis elsewhere expressed, *Ephes.* ii. towards the latter End. Wherefore Mr. *A*——*s*'s wire-drawn Argument for the Worship of the Spirit, from this Text, becomes weak, and of none Effect.

The next Passage from whence he strives to infer it, is, 1 *Cor.* xii. 7—11. where the Apostle assures us, That to one is given by the *Spirit* the Word of Wisdom,—to another Faith by the *same Spirit*,—to another the Working of Miracles;—but all these worketh that *one and the self-same Spirit*, dividing to every Man severally, as he will. 'Whence it is plain, says 'Mr. *A*——*s*, that he is, what none but God Most 'High can be, the Principle, Author, and Disposer 'of all spiritual Gifts and Graces. Is not then Wor'ship due to him? Shall we not pray to him, who is 'the immediate Giver and Worker of all these Gifts 'and Graces?' But one would be apt to suspect this Man had not read, or, however, not heedfully attended to the Verses going before, *ver.* 4, 5, & 6. in which St. *Paul* says, There are Diversities of Gifts, but the same *Spirit*: And there are Differences of *Administrations*, but the *same Lord*: And there are Diversities of Operations, but it is the *same God* which worketh all, and in all. Where the *Gradation* seems to me remarkably fine and beautiful. The Apostle begins with the *Holy Spirit*, and his various Gifts: Then comes to the *Lord*, i. e. our Saviour Jesus Christ, and his several Administrations: And, at length, ends with GOD, and his Energies, or Workings. It is the same God who worketh *all in all*, i. e. God the Father, who is *Fons Deitatis*, and *primum omnium*

Principium,

Principium, as *Erasmus* and *Beza* on the Place speak. Αὐτὸς ὁ Πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐνεργεῖ καὶ δίδωσι τὰ πάντα. He, the *Father* himself, through the Word, in, or by the Spirit, worketh and giveth all Things, says *Athanasius*, in his Comment on the Passage, Epist. 1. ad Serap. de Spiritu Sancto; which is a sufficient Direction to any attentive Reader, how what St. *Paul* afterwards affirms, *ver.* 11. is to be understood. Let the Reader consult on the 4th, 5th, and 6th Verses, an excellent Discourse of Dr. *Clarke*'s, Vol. VI. *p.* 105, *&* *seq.* and he may see a brief, easy Explication of them in Dr. *Watts*'s Dissertations, Part II. *p.* 171.

Another Text that Mr. *A——s* alledges in Behalf of worshipping the Holy Ghost by Prayer, is, *Rev.* i. 4. 'Where, says he, the Apostle *John* prays for 'Grace and Peace to the seven Churches in *Asia*, not 'only from him which is, and which was, and which 'is to come; but from the *seven Spirits* which are 'before his Throne, *i. e.* the *Holy Ghost*, so described 'from the Fulness and Variety of his gracious Opera-'tions, as is not only clear from the Nature of 'Things, and all the Words of the Text, but put 'beyond all Doubt from Chap. iv. 5. Chap. v. 6. 'compared with *Zech.* iii. 9. and Chap. iv. 10.' But the learned *Jos. Mede* has a Dissertation on the last cited Place, to prove the contrary: And he undertakes to shew, 'That by the seven *Spirits* here, the 'Holy Ghost cannot be meant, but rather seven arch, 'or principal Angels, agreeable to the Tradition of 'the *Jews*.' See this Author's Works, *p.* 42. Dr. *Hammond* too thinks, and endeavours to prove it, 'That by the seven Spirits, Angels are denoted,' Annotations, *p.* 767. 'And if it be thought strange, that '*John* should pray for Grace and Peace from these 'Beings, as here he may seem to do, I answer, says 'he, first, That the Words Peace be to, or with 'you, and others like them, are but a Form of Greet-'ing, or Salutation, which includes in it all good

'Wishes of the Things mention'd, but not a solemn 'Prayer to the [Person or] Persons named in the 'Form: [There being a considerable Difference, as 'he shews, between Salutations or Greetings, and for-'mal Prayers.] But, secondly, Supposing it a Pray-'er, yet, as the Action of Prayer is not addressed to 'the seven Spirits, whether *immediately*, or *termina-'tively*, there can be no Inconvenience from thence 'to define the Spirits to be Angels. For 'tis certain, 'the Angels are used by God as Instruments to con-'vey his Mercies to us; (and the Word *Peace*, as the '*Hebrew Shalom*, in Salutations, especially signifies all 'Kind of Mercies, all Prosperity) and then those 'Mercies come from the Angels immediately, though 'originally from God, *&c.*' The Reader may also see the worthy Mr. *Baxter*, on the Place, who notes, 1. 'That it is Angels, and not the Holy Ghost's se-'ven Graces, that are here meant, is after manifested. 'Farther, This is no Prayer to these Angels, but a 'Notice of God's Mercies [or Benefits] communicated 'to the Churches, by their Ministry.'

The last Text cited by Mr. *A——s*, as home and full to his Purpose, is, 1 *Thess.* iii. 5. 'The Lord di-'rect your Hearts into the Love of God, and into 'the patient Waiting for Christ. Here, says he, are 'all the three mentioned, and each distinguished from 'the other, so that we cannot mistake. The Prayer 'is then addressed immediately to the *Spirit*, here 'called the Lord, that he would direct, *i. e.* turn 'and incline them to, and establish them in, the 'Love of the Father, καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 'and into the Patience of Christ. This is the Spi-'rit's particulrr Work, and to him the Prayer is plain-'ly put up, *p.* 21, 22.' But we have no need to understand, by the Term *Lord* in this Text, any other Person than is generally supposed to be denoted by it in the Context, as well as throughout the New Testament, namely, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. For though, I grant, that if so there will be

a Repetition of Characters, in one and the ſame Sentence, belonging to the *ſame* Perſon; yet this is not *new* with St. *Paul*; the like is to be obſerved elſewhere, once and again, in his Epiſtles. 1 *Theſſ.* iii. 12, 13. The Lord make you to increaſe and abound in Love towards all Men, to the End He may eſtabliſh your Hearts unblameable in Holineſs before God, even our Father, at the Coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And, 1 *Cor.* i. 7, 8. Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall alſo confirm you unto the End, that ye may be blameleſs in the Day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. In which Paſſage, as Dr. *Clarke* takes Notice, 'The 'Name Jeſus Chriſt is expreſly added to the Appella-'tion Lord, in both Parts of the Sentence.' *Vid.* Script. Doct. p. 127. and Commentary on forty ſelect Texts, in Anſwer to *Nelſon*, p. 203, 204. And 'may not Prayer be offered to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, 'not only for Bleſſings, which he himſelf beſtows 'on us, but thoſe alſo which are beſtowed more im-'mediately by his Spirit, ſuch as Illumination, Sanc-'tification, and Sim? This the Scripture teaches in 'ſeveral Places, Dr. *Watts*'s Chriſt. Doct. p. 210.' I leave it now to the Deciſion of any impartial Reader, whether *one clear* Command, or Example, for putting up Prayers directly to the Perſon of the Spirit, has been, or is likely to be produc'd.

My Letter adds, that, I think, in nothing Chriſtians ought to be more cautious of being wiſe above what is written, than in the Affair of *religious Worſhip*, p. 8. The Reaſon whereof is obvious and plain, ſeeing one *ſpecial* End for which the Scripture was given, was to *direct* and *regulate our* Worſhip: Nor can there be any *better*, or more perfect Forms of it, than thoſe which are here ſet down [a]. And hence, according

[a] It were much to be wiſhed, therefore, that the moſt *ancient* Forms had always been preferred:——And that the Way uſed in the Primitive Church (after the Example of *Scripture*) of directing Worſhip, particularly Prayers, uniformly to the Perſon of the *Father*,

according to the next Position in my Letter, if we are not to *confine* ourselves altogether to the *Doxologies* of Scripture; 'tis *safest*, however, to adhere and keep to these: Because, in so doing, we are plainly under the Protection of a *divine* Warrant and Rule. Nor does Mr. *A——s* dare to speak in Contradiction of this. However, says he, *p.* 15. 'Surely it can't be '*unsafe* to ascribe equal Glory to each of them, to 'whom we are equally dedicated in Baptism.' But if he could prove, which hitherto he has not been able to do, that we are dedicated in Baptism to *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*, and that equally; 'twill remain a Question, whether a Person is safe in addressing Doxologies to them, and giving them equal Glory and Honour, having no *Direction* nor *Orders* so to do from the New Testament. Can it be safe to practise of *our own Heads*, in Matters of so high and momentous a Nature, as those of Christian Worship? What Answer shall we make, if the Question be ask'd us, Who hath required such Things at your Hands?

I go on, and say, that when Glory and Honour are, at any Time, ascribed to *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*, I would be understood to mean what is *respectively* due to them, for their distinct *Powers*, *Offices*, and *Agencies* in the *Creation*, *Government*, *Redemption*, *Sanctification*, and *Salvation* of Man, *p.* 8. Concerning which the Reader will be pleased to observe, that I speak it not with any Intention to *abet* or *encourage* the *common Doxologies*, wherein are those Ascriptions: But only to let all know, with whom I am concern'd in Worship, when such Doxologies are used, what

ther, in the *Name*, and through the *Mediation of the Son*, by the *Assistance*, and under the *Direction* and *Influence* of the *Holy Spirit*, had been constantly retained; rather than that Forms composed in the later and disputaceous Ages of the Church had been introduced. Many of the most eminent of the first Reformers were of this Opinion; and the most considerate Persons, in all Times, who have been disposed to prefer Peace and Charity in the Church of God, before other Considerations, have, in this Matter, agreed with them. See Modest Plea, *p.* 117, 118. and also *p.* 176, 177.

what Construction I put upon them in my own Mind. And whereas Mr. *A——s* seems to be displeased with applying the Term *Office* to God the *Father*, in that he speaks of it as quite *strange*, or new to him, and what he never heard of before [a]: He hereby plainly shews, how well read and vers'd he is in the Trinitarian Controversy. Dr. *Clarke*, in his excellent Introduction to his Script. Doct. p. 35. has the Term so applied: And from thence it was, indeed, I borrowed most of the Expressions above-mentioned, *viz.* Powers, Offices, *&c.* The same celebrated Writer, in a Sermon of his before referred to, on 1 *Cor.* xii. 4, 5, 6. begins thus. 'In these Words we have an 'Account of three divine Persons concerned in bring-'ing about the Salvation of Men; and a brief De-'claration of the Nature of their several *Offices*, in 'accomplishing that great and merciful Design.' And after having considered briefly that which is speculative, relating to their Essence, he comes to consider that which is moral, relating to their *Offices*, p. 121. The Remarker on Dr. *Clarke*'s Script. Doct. p. 101. says, 'There is, no Doubt, Honour due to each Per-'son [of the Trinity] distinctly, upon Account of 'their respective Characters, Powers, and *Offices*: 'This is the acknowledged Doctrine of our Church, '*&c.*' Again, *p.* 128. 'As to what is purely theo-'logical in this Matter, *viz.* the distinct Powers, and '*Offices* of the three Persons in the Creation, Govern-'ment, Redemption, and Sanctification of Man, in 'these Things the Orthodox agree with Dr. *Clarke*, 'and with Mr. *Whiston*, and with all that allow a 'Trinity of Persons in any Sense.' The Author of a Letter to Mr. *Cummin* tells him, *p.* 6. 'Sir, the 'Faith once delivered to the Saints, was but *one*, and 'that delivered once, for all, in the Words of Christ 'and his Apostles. Content yourself with that Faith, 'and we are agreed. Will you be satisfied with

'what

[a] I confess I never heard of the Office, or Offices, of the Father, till now, *p.* 15.

'what the Father has ſaid of himſelf, of the Son, 'and of the Holy Ghoſt? Will Chriſt's own Decla- 'rations of the Father, Himſelf, and the Holy Spi- 'rit, pleaſe you? Will all that is ſaid by the four 'Evangeliſts, and all the other canonical Writers, 'concerning the Sacred Three, ſufficiently deſcribe 'their Nature, Diſtinctions, and *Offices?* &c.' Dr. *Watts*, Chriſt. Doct. *p.* 190. lays down this Propoſition: 'We are bound to pay divine Honours to each 'of the Sacred Three, *viz.* the Father, the Son, and 'the Holy Ghoſt, according to their diſtinct Charac- 'ters and *Offices* aſſigned them in Scripture.' After which he proceeds to conſider in what Manner the Scripture repreſents their diſtinct Characters and *Offices*: 'And firſt (ſays he) of the *Father*.' Again, *p.* 231. 'We may, in our Thoughts (when the common 'Doxologies are uſed) give Adoration and Thanks to 'each of the Sacred Three, for the various and diſ- 'tinct *Offices* they ſuſtain, and diſtinct Benefits we 'receive from them.' And Dr. *Waterland* has the Term *Office* applied to the Father very frequently in his Writings. Second Defence, *p.* 20. 'Supre- 'macy of *Office*, by mutual Concert and Agreement, 'belongs to the Father.' *P.* 45. 'The Father is in '*Office* ſuperior, by mutual Concert and Agreement.' *P.* 111. 'Conſidering the two Perſons, Father and 'Son, and their diſtinct *Offices*.' *P.* 177. 'It was more 'congruous, that he who was firſt in Order (namely, 'the Father) ſhould be firſt in *Office* too.'

My Letter concludes the Head I have been upon thus. The aſcribing the *ſame* or *equal* Glory to Father, Son, and Spirit, adoring them as *three Perſons*, and the *one true*, and *living*, *ſupreme God*, or devoting and dedicating ourſelves to them *as ſuch*; I cannot help ſignifying my great Diſſatisfaction with, and 'tis what I do, from this Time, enter a ſerious Proteſt againſt, *p.* 8. This, Mr. *Anonymous* imagines, will be regarded by none but thoſe like myſelf; and ſays, it deſerves no other Treatment, than to be laugh'd

at, *p.* 17. But let him deride, and ſport himſelf with it as long as he pleaſes, or dares. I now publickly renew the Proteſt, and enter it a-freſh; as a Proteſt againſt a Practice that is *unſcriptural*, and an Innovation in the ſolemn Worſhip of Chriſtians, juſtly offenſive: Whereof I am more thoroughly convinced than ever, ſince the peruſing of a late Pamphlet, written by my worthy and good Friend Mr. *Martin Tompkins*, entitled, A calm Enquiry, whether we have any Warrant from Scripture, for our addreſſing ourſelves in a Way of Prayer, or Praiſe, to the Holy Spirit; to which the Reader is referr'd.

I have now finiſh'd all I deſigned, both for explaining and defending that Part of my Letter which relates to the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

But I can't conclude, without animadverting a little on the MANNER wherein Mr. *A——s* treats what I have ſaid in *this* Part, as alſo in the preceding Introduction to it. Had *he*, or any one elſe, who might think me miſtaken, endeavoured, in a Way becoming a *Chriſtian*, or even a *Scholar*, and a *well-bred Man*, to convince me of my Miſtakes, and ſet me right; I ſhould have thought myſelf obliged to him, and given him ſincere Thanks. For I agree with Mr. *Locke*, that if a Man, as a ſincere Friend to the Perſon, and to the Truth, labours to bring another out of Error, he is acting a very *beautiful*, and a *kind Part*. 'There can be nothing, ſays he, more 'beautiful, nor more beneficial[a].' But the Reader will ſoon ſee how far what I now ſuppoſe is, with *reſpect to Mr.* A——s, from being the Caſe. To paſs by here his *putting on ſuperior Airs*, *affecting a domineering*, *inſulting Strain*, *applying to the Paſſions* and *Prejudices of his Readers*, *exclaiming*, *haranguing*, and the like *ſmaller Blemiſhes* to any Author's Performance; ſome or other of which are viſible in every Page: I ſhall confine my Obſervations to Faults, in his Manner of writing, of a much *groſſer Sort*, and ſome of

 the

[a] Vol. II. *p.* 671.

the *worst* that a Writer can be guilty of. The *first* I would mention, is, dealing *unfairly* in his Quotations of Passages, and designedly *misrepresenting* their *Sense*. Several Instances of this might be produced: Let it suffice to point out a very flagrant one almost at the Entrance of his Postscript, *p.* 2. 'When he [meaning Mr. *G.*] came to *Hackney*, he set himself to study — has read the best Authors on both Sides; but above all, *searched the Scriptures* — and, he hopes, carefully implored the *divine Teachings* —— and the Result of all has been a Change of Belief, *&c.* [or, as in Page 1. a Change of Belief and Opinion, about sundry Points of Religion, the Capital, or Fundamental, not excepted.] He dares not, you see, positively say, he has so diligently and impartially implored *those Teachings*, but only *he hopes* he has. However, we have here a tacit, but dreadful Confession, he did none of them before, *&c.*' Now the Passage, without being disjointed and mutilated at this Rate, is thus. [Being come to *Hackney*] 'I set myself to study them, *i. e.* Matters of Religion, AFRESH, especially such as are *reckon'd* the principal, and most important; and I have read the Authors, who are esteemed to have writ best upon these, of both Sides; but above all, searched the Scriptures relating to them, I hope, with Care, Diligence, and Impartiality, [*N. B.*] IMPLORING, AT THE SAME TIME, DIVINE TEACHINGS, to be kept and delivered from Error, and led into the Truth. The Result of this has been a Change of Belief and Opinion about sundry Points of Religion, and *some* that are *reckoned* capital, or fundamental, not excepted, *&c.*' 'Tis plain then, that Mr. *A*——*s* has quoted me here, not only *disingenuously*, but *dishonestly* too: And concerning his Intention in so doing, a Judgment may easily be formed, by what soon after follows, *p.* 3. 'He did not do this (*i. e. search the Scriptures*, and *pray* for the *Spirit* to *lead him into Truth*) as himself here implies. And

yet

'yet the Author has been long a *Preacher*, has been 'several Years ordained, did then give a Confession 'of what he called his Faith, in the Sight of God, 'and before you, and *all*, before he had done these 'Things! What a shocking Account is this! How 'can he expect to be believed? What Candour, what 'Charity does he deserve!'

A second Fault in this Writer is, his frequent *joining* of me with *others*, and those Persons of the most *invidious Names* and *Characters* in *Fashion*, and slily insinuating an Agreement between *my* Notions and Sentiments, and *theirs*. Nothing is more common with him, than this. Instances of it every where occur. I shall content myself with bringing one or two of the most notorious. *P.* 9. 'Christianity, says he, 'in the first Ages, was spread by the great Preachers 'of *this Doctrine*, [meaning the same that he espouses, 'or the *Athanasian*.] *Ebion*, *Cerinthus*, the *Gnosticks*, '*Paulus Samosatenus*, *Arius*, *Sabellius*, and the Anti-'trinitarian Crew, their Followers, never spread Christ-'ianity any where. Our Religion, where-ever it was 'preached, prevailed, thro' the Power of the Holy 'Ghost; nor was ever its Progress and irresistible Run 'checked, in any Country, till *Men of his* Principles 'corrupted it. Nor was it ever rooted out of any 'Nation, till this great Foundation of it was op-'posed, ridiculed, and blasphemed, by the impious 'Wretches above named, and their Disciples, and 'then the *Holy Spirit*, as we might well suppose, 'withdrew his enlightening, renewing, and sanctify-'ing Influences; and God was, in his holy and just 'Judgment, provoked to *give up those who received* '*not the Truth in the Love thereof, to believe Lies.* 'Then did *Mahomet* arise, and carry away so great 'a Part of those, who having given up this Doc-'trine, were little more than *Christians in Name*, 'with an ill-concerted Jumble of *Jewish*, *Heathenish*, 'and *Anti-Christian* Dotages, blended with several 'Truths, obvious from the Law of Nature.' Again,

p. 11. 'Mr. *Gibbs*, and all *his Brethren*, muſt own, 'that *Chriſt is God*, and, conſequently, a living and 'true God; and, therefore, that there are at leaſt *two* '*Gods*, which is evidently contrary to the whole 'Scripture, and abſolutely inconſiſtent with *natural* '*Religion*. Dare any of *them* ſay, that this Doctrine 'will forward the Converſion of the *Jews*? — Whoſoever ſhall be inſtrumental in their Converſion, *theſe* '*Gentlemen* ſhall not.' *Ibid.* 'Had not thoſe who 'were called Chriſtians fallen from their Faith, not 'one of them could ever have been brought to embrace the Reveries of the Impoſtor *Mahomet*. And 'what is there in *theſe Mens* Schemes which ſhould 'induce the *Mahometans* to change their Religion? 'They ſpeak almoſt as honourably of Chriſt, as *theſe Men* do: And Mr. *Gibbs*, and *his Friends*, expect '*little more* from *him* they call *their Saviour*, than 'thoſe do from their Prophet[a].' The putting a Man thus ever and anon into the *Plural Number*, and joining him with Company of ſuch *ill Repute*, to whom he is no Ways allied, is a Practice to be complained of as downright *iniquitous*: And one can hardly forbear thinking, that Mr. *A——s* learn'd it from a Book of Dr. *Edwards*'s, written againſt Mr. *Locke*, and entitled, *Socinianiſm* Unmaſk'd, where a Plenty of like Inſtances of it are to be met with. And 'tis particularly obſervable of the Doctor, that beſides his aiming, quite thro' the Book, to repreſent Mr. *Locke* as all over *ſocinianized*, he, in ſome Places, inſinuates, that great Man had conſulted the *Mahometan Bible*, and that *his* Creed, and the *Turks*, did not much differ, but was in a *Manner* the *ſame*, of the ſame Size, or *Scantling*, as the Doctor is pleaſed to term it, and equally *lank*, p. 53, 54, 55.

This leads to a third egregious Fault, which I would take Notice of in Mr. *Anonymous*, as a *Writer*; and that is, his aſſerting *Falſhoods* of me, and *laying*

[a] Let the Reader alſo ſee *p.* 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22.

laying to my Charge, Things wholly undeserved. Thus, *p.* 22. says he, 'Mr. G. has *no where* declared, whether 'he believes there is *only one God*, or whether there is 'more than one;' tho' with the Apostle St. *Paul*, I say (speaking it as the Matter of my Belief) that to us [Christians] there *is* ONE GOD, THE FATHER, of *whom are all Things*, and *we for him:* Again, ONE GOD, AND FATHER OF ALL, who *is above all*, and *through all*, and *in us all.*——*P.* 12. 'Mr G. says he, '*denies*, that Men have *Righteousness* in CHRIST, or 'that they, excepting a *very few*, need renewing 'Grace,' to which two *&* *cætera's* are clapt.——*Ibid.* 'If ever they, the *Mahometans*, are converted, it 'must be in Expectation of having Wisdom, Righ-'teousness, Sanctification, and Redemption in *Christ* '*Jesus*, which they can have in no other; and 'which, *this Man* SAYS, they *cannot have* in *his* Sa-'viour; but we know they may have in *ours.*'——*P.* 15. 'Mr. G. has mightily *lessened* the Account the '*Scripture* gives us of Redemption, yea, he has *quite* '*denied* it.' Here are several Facts *positively asserted*, and heavy *Accusations* brought: Each of which I expect Mr. *A*——*s* to *prove*, by shewing the *Places* and *Words* wherein I deny and affirm, as he says I do; or else that he owns he cannot; and, I think, he should ask Pardon, at least, for having published to the World such Calumnies, and false Accusations. I believe, admire, and adore the *Scripture Account* of Man's Redemption by the *Lord Jesus Christ.* Produce me *any* Proposition relating to this, out of the Gospel, and I am ready to subscribe it with *Heart* and *Hand:* Particularly what St. *Paul* teaches, 'That of 'God are Men in Christ Jesus; who is made (or be-'comes to them) Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctifica-'tion, and Redemption.' And, by the Way, I here declare to Mr. *A*——*s*, and the World, that I am no *Socinian*, nor *Arian.* *The peculiar distinctive* Notions, both of *Arius*, and *Socinus*, I disclaim, and take to be wrong.

The

The last Thing to be observed in this Author's Way of Writing, is, *great Uncharitableness*, and *Censoriousness*: Of which also there are glaring Instances up and down, more than a few. *P.* 2. says he, 'Some have thought, that *his* [meaning my] Advancement to the pastoral Office, an Honour he 'was never like to be called to where he was, 'and [a] - - - - - - - - - were as considerable Inducements 'to accept of an Invitation from you.' *Ibid.* 'We 'have here a tacit, but dreadful Confession, he did 'none of these Things (neither read, study, nor pray) '*before*: At least, it is plain, he did them not as he '*should*: For if he had, the Result would have been 'the same.——The divine Teachings never did, never can, lead any Man into Error.——To impute 'such a Change of Belief [as his] in any Measure to 'these; or father such Things upon the Spirit of 'God, has more *desperate Wickedness* in it, than some 'Men seem to be aware of. But - - - - - - - - - -' *P.* 17. 'As if the Protestation of one who had been *stifling* '*his own* Convictions in these Matters, and *imposing* so 'long upon the World, could be any how regarded 'by any but those like himself, or deserved any other 'Treatment, than to be laughed at.' *P.* 21. 'Our 'Adversaries would do well to consider, whether 'their denying, that the Father, the Son, and the 'Holy Ghost, are *the one God* of *Christians*, and '*their God*, be not a *Renouncing of the Baptismal Co*'*venant*.' *P.* 22. 'Mr. *G.* has, without all Decen'cy, set himself to *oppose* and *blaspheme* this great 'Fundamental in our Religion, and told you, very 'bluntly, what he does no longer believe, though it 'is with me a Question, if ever he believed it! *P.* 24. 'I am pretty sure, if the whole Scripture was search'ed from End to End, and all the Passages gathered

'and

[a] A remarkable Blank truly this: And left on Purpose, as it should seem, for the Reader's Imagination, to fill up, by conceiving and suspecting the worst. We have another presently after of like Sort.

'and compared, which any Ways relate to this Mat-
'ter (*viz.* the Trinity) that *very few*, if *any*, could
'be so charitable as to think the *Deniers of this Doc-*
'*trine* [he must mean the Doctrine stated, according
'to *him*, and the *Athanasians*] were BELIEVERS OF
'THEIR BIBLE.' Such are the Faults which Mr. *Anonymous*, in his Way and Manner of writing against me, is guilty of. And yet *this Man* lays Claim to the Character of a *true Protestant*; and is known to sustain the Office of a *Christian Divine*[a]. *Both* which (if I may be allowed the Freedom to tell him so) serve but to *aggravate* his Faults, and render him more *inexcusable* in committing them.

The *grand essential Principle* of Protestantism, and its truest, surest *Basis or Foundation* is, a *Right of judging, by the Scripture-Standard, as to all Matters of Religion:* Which Right belongs to Christians, and Men *equally*, and indiscriminately, to one, as *much* as to another; as, by Consequence, likewise does the unrestrained *Use* or *Exercise* of this Right. '*Protestants*,
'if really so, and upon Principle, (to borrow Part of
'the Description of them given us by an able Hand)
'do not only assert and maintain the Right of *Church-*
'*es*, or of larger Bodies of Men, to bring *any* Opi-
'nions, or Usages, in Vogue, to the Standard of the
'Law and the Testimony, but they allow and en-
'courage *every particular* Person to make a *free*
'*Judgment* of the Rule. As every Man is to an-
'swer for himself, in the future Account, and has
'the Holy Scriptures put into his Hands by divine
'Appointment, for his Guidance: So he is bound to
'judge for himself, according to the Light he has,
'and upon using the best Methods he can think of
'for understanding the Word of God, particularly
'comparing

[a] Towards the Close of the Dedication of his Book, entitled, The Assembly's shorter Catechism rescu'd, he subscribes himself a *hearty Protestant*; and, I think, I have good Vouchers to prove, that he is a Dissenting Minister: I find him quoted in a late Pamphlet, entitled, A Dialogue between a Baptist and a Churchman, by the Name of *Millar*.

'comparing the Passages which seem more *obscure* 'with the *plainer* Places of Scripture: And having 'a just Regard to the Rules of Interpretation used in 'other Writings, and to the Reason of Things, with-'out offering any arbitrary, or unreasonable Sense, 'or construing them into any Thing impossible or ab-'surd. And if, upon this Examination, he cannot 'agree with the Generality of his Neighbours, in the 'Apprehensions he forms of the Sense of his Bible; 'he ought, as an honest Man, and a good Christian, 'to dissent from the Majority. 'Tis neither Arro-'gance, nor affected Singularity, to suppose himself 'in the Right, though he should have Numbers a-'gainst him. The Minority, by an upright and 'diligent Enquiry into the Meaning of the Sacred 'Writings, may understand them better than a Crowd 'of People, who use not the same Sincerity, or Ap-'plication. And, certainly, to a Protestant, this ought 'to be no strange Supposition: For as such, he is a 'Protester against a Majority in the Wrong. The 'Reformation could never have been begun, if a '*Luther*, or the like, must be debarred from judging, 'till a Number came to be of the same Sentiments. 'And the very Protest itself[a] was made by a less 'Number of Princes, and Imperial Cities, who had 'been out-voted in the Diet. And by the same 'Reason, that a lesser Part of the Christian Church 'may differ from a far greater, which still adheres 'to the Papacy, or a smaller Number of the States 'of the same Empire dissent from the prevailing 'Part; it must undeniably follow, that *every pri-'vate* Man is a competent Judge of the Rule for 'himself, and bound to abide by that which he thinks 'to be the Truth and Will of God, whoever are of 'another Mind'. Occasional Paper, N°. II. *p.* 11, 12, 13. Again, *p.* 19, 20. says the same good Writer, 'He that openly, or designedly opposes an 'Examination

[a] The Protest of six Princes, and fourteen free Cities of *Germany*, against the Decree of the Diet at *Spire*.

'Examination into the prevailing Sentiments or Cuſ-
'toms of his Time, and Country, by the Word of
'God, indeed, retains the *Spirit*, though he may
'diſown the *Name* of *Popery*. He denies the Biſhop
'of *Rome* that Tyranny over the Church, but uſurps
'it himſelf. Suppoſe his Pretence for it ſhould be,
'that the Matter has been already examin'd, and well
'ſettled at the Reformation; that can, by no Means,
'excuſe his Conduct. That which was a true Prin-
'ciple then, is ever ſo. The firſt Reformers were
'no more infallible than thoſe who went before them,
'though they ſaw farther than many of their Pre-
'deceſſors. Nor is the preſent Age any more obliged
'to acquieſce in *their* Deciſions, than they were con-
'cluded by the Determinations of preceding Ages.
'Indeed, to pretend a Neceſſity of leaving the Re-
'formation juſt where they brought it, is to make
'*them* our Rule, inſtead of the Bible; and to ſet up
'an Infallibility in the *Reformers*, after we have re-
'nounced it in the *Pope*. The Popiſh Church avow-
'edly and honeſtly declares againſt a private Judg-
'ment, and that all are obliged to adhere to the In-
'terpretations of a Pope, or Council. If any, who
'call themſelves Proteſtants, would only change the
'Hands wherein this Power ſhall be lodg'd from the
'Pope, or a Council of his Creatures, to the Civil
'Magiſtrate, or a Synod of their own Kidney; and
'make them the Lords of my Conſcience, and de-
'clare them to have Authority to preſcribe to me
'what Religion they pleaſe, or (which is the *ſame*
'*Thing*) *what Senſe I muſt put upon the Scripture*: In
'this Caſe, I ſee not how the Reformation has mend-
'ed my Circumſtances. By this Scheme, the ſame
'ſpiritual Tyranny which was before in the Pope, is
'transferred to the Civil Power, or the prevailing
'Party in a Nation: With this very great Diſadvan-
'tage and Abſurdity on the Proteſtant Side; that here
'the People have the Bible put into their Hands, but
'muſt not uſe it; while Popery is more conſiſtent:

'There, because I cannot, with Safety, use my Bible myself, the Temptation is kept out of my Way. The genuine Principles of a Protestant bid Defiance to both Usurpations alike.——Once more, if any should tell me, I must judge for myself; but when I have done so, must not *profess* any Thing different from the common Opinion of my Neighbours; or be punish'd if I will not subscribe the publick Faith; or if I should act otherwise in religious Matters than they do; this carries the Insult upon Protestant Principles still higher. They give me more Opportunity, than I could have in a *Popish* Country, to *know* my Master's Will; but I must, therefore, play the Hypocrite, in forbearing to do it under fuller Light. They tantalize me, by letting me know my Right to a private Judgment; and then, in the Face of the Sun, can *say to my Soul, bow down, that we may go over.*'

To *these* Principles and Positions, *truly Protestant*, I would add a few *more*, from the excellent Mr. *Locke*, Second Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity, *p.* 648. Vol. II. 'How fully soever I am persuaded of the Truth of what I hold, I am, in common Justice, to allow the same Sincerity to him that differs from me; and so we are upon equal Terms. This Persuasion of Truth, on each Side, invests neither of us with a Right to censure, or condemn the other. I have no more Reason to treat him ill for differing from me, than he has to treat me ill, for the same Cause: Pity him, I may; inform him fairly, I ought; But contemn, malign, revile, or any *otherwise* prejudice him, for not thinking just as I do, that I ought not. *My Orthodoxy* gives me no more Authority over him, than *his* (for every one is orthodox to himself) gives him over me. When the Word *Orthodoxy* (which in Effect signifies no more but the Opinions of my Party) is made Use of as a Pretence to domineer (as ordinarily it is) it is, and ever will be, ridiculous.

Mr.

Mr. *A*——*s*'s Way of oppoſing me, therefore, appears bad enough, if we look on him only as a *Proteſtant*: But how much worſe ſtill will it appear, if we view him alſo in the Light of a *Divine*, or Teacher of Chriſtian Religion. As *ſuch*, he ought to be *exemplary* for *Truth*, *Veracity*, *Juſtice*, *fair and equitable Dealing*: yea, *Goodneſs*, *Love*, *Charity*, *Gentleneſs*, *mutual Forbearance*, and every other Chriſtian Virtue and Grace. As *ſuch* (more eſpecially) he is exhorted ‘ to conſent to wholeſome Words, *even the Words of* ‘ *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* (ſpoken by himſelf, and by ‘ his Apoſtles) and to the Doctrine which is according to Godlineſs; being told what the Man muſt be ‘ eſteemed who refuſes to do this, 1 *Tim.* vi. 3, 4. ‘ *As ſuch*, he is required, after the Example of *Timothy*, to hold faſt the *Goſpel-Doctrine*, PURE and ‘ UNMIXED; to retain it in the very *ſame* PLAINNESS and SIMPLICITY wherein St. *Paul*, and the ‘ other Apoſtles, left it: And that not only with ‘ Faith, or *Fidelity*, but with *Love* and *Charity* towards all honeſt Minds, though they might not ‘ have ſo much Knowledge of it as he had, or might ‘ differ from him in ſome Particulars. 1 *Tim.* ii. 13. ‘ Hold faſt the Form of ſound Words, which thou ‘ haſt heard of ME, with *Faith*, and *Love*, which is ‘ in *Chriſt Jeſus*. Vid. *Benſon* in Loc. As ſuch, moreover, he is apprized, that he ought not to *ſtrive*, ‘ *i. e.* to contend with *Fierceneſs*, *Anger*, or *undue* ‘ *Warmth*, againſt the Adverſaries of the Chriſtian ‘ Religion, no, not even the moſt violent and deſperate: But, inſtead of this, that he ſhould treat ‘ them with *Meekneſs* and *Sweetneſs* of Temper, and ‘ endeavour to gain them over, if poſſible, by *Gentleneſs*, *Forbearance*, and Methods of the like Sort. ‘ 1 *Tim.* ii. 24, & *ſeq.* The Servant of the Lord [the ‘ Miniſter of the Goſpel] muſt not *ſtrive* [with any] ‘ but be *gentle* unto *all* Men; apt to teach, *patient*, ‘ or forbearing; in *Meekneſs* inſtructing thoſe that *oppoſe* themſelves; if God, peradventure will give them

‘ Repen-

"Repentance (change their Minds, and being them-
"selves *to the acknowledging of the Truth*; *and that they*
"*recover themselves out of the Snare of the Devil, who*
"*are taken captive by him at his Will.*" How unsuit-
able then to the Character of a *Protestant*; but especi-
ally that of a *Preacher*, or *Divine*, Mr. *A*——'s
Treatment of *me* has been; and what Aggravation
the Immorality of it receives from his wearing these
Characters, is left with him coolly and seriously to
consider.

FINIS.